

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLVII NOVEMBER, 1932

Number 7

THE FIRST GOTHIC REVIVAL AND THE RETURN TO NATURE

It is one of the commonplaces of the history of taste that in the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth century Gothic architecture was generally regarded by well-bred persons with contempt. Its very name was a term of disparagement; for the adjective "gothic" was a word which it was fashionable to apply to all manner of objects in a sense equivalent to "barbarous and tasteless." A typical virtuoso of the early seventeen-forties, just returned from the *grand tour*, is described as "perpetually railing at the climate and manners of his native country, and pronouncing the word gothic fifty times an hour."¹ It performed much the same necessary function that, in certain circles, the adjective "Victorian" performs today. Tight-lacing was, to those who disapproved of it, a "gothic ligament";² and duelling was denounced by Bishop Berkeley as a "Gothic crime."³ A received opinion from which one dissented was a *préjugé gothique*.⁴ The term also took on a certain political coloring; since it not only vaguely suggested "the old-fashioned" in general, but, more specifically, the political and social system of the Middle Ages, *i. e.*, feudalism, it sometimes served the progressives of the period as an unpleasant way of referring to anything the Tories approved—as in a couplet in Akenside's *Odes* (1745):

And now that England spurns her Gothic chain,
And equal laws and social science reign.⁵

¹ In the prose satire *Ranelagh House*, 1747. It is attributed by Halkett and Laing to "Joseph Wharton."

² Mason, *English Garden*, I, note 1.

³ *Alciphron*, V, 13.

⁴ Rousseau, *Dialogues*, I.

⁵ Book I, Ode I.

In Thomas Warton's juvenile poem *The Triumph of Isis*:

'Twas theirs new plans of liberty to frame:
And on the Gothic gloom of slavish sway
To shed the dawn of intellectual day.

At the very end of the century a French writer observed that "en-core aujourd'hui, par la force d'un long usage, le mot *gothique* exprime tout ce qui dans les arts et dans les mœurs rappelle les siècles d'ignorance."⁶ Other examples of the depreciative use of the term may be found in abundance in the historical dictionaries and manuals of literary history.

While this general connotation of the word helped to give the architectural style literally a bad name, to link it verbally in the thought of the period with a number of other things in ill repute, it is necessary, in order to understand the more significant motives, or ostensible motives, of the dislike of Gothic buildings, to note what aesthetic qualities were supposed to be characteristic of such buildings. And to this end we must first ask what edifices, or what specific style, eighteenth-century writers had in mind when they applied the adjective to architecture. The word had in fact—as has not, I believe, been generally noted—three distinct denotations; and with each of these different grounds of disapproval were associated. (1) It frequently signifies any structure not in the classical style; examples of this may be found in the Oxford Dictionary; *e. g.*, 1693, Dryden's translation of Du Fresnoy: "All that is not in the ancient gust is called a barbarous or Gothic manner"; 1742 Langley's *Ancient Architecture*, Diss. I.: "Every ancient building which is not in the Grecian mode is called a Gothic building." (Langley himself, however, thought the style, at least in its English manifestations, should more properly be called "Saxon"). In the *Encyclopédie* we are told that "cette manière barbare a infesté les beaux arts depuis 611 jusqu'en 1450." But (2) in many cases it is clearly of the Romanesque (in England the Saxon or the Norman) style that those who write of "the Gothic" are thinking—a style which many supposed to have been actually introduced by the Goths or other Northern barbarian invaders of the Roman empire. This Nordic theory of the origin of Gothic goes back at least to Vasari (1550), who refers to *una specie di*

⁶ *Encycl. méthodique: Architecture*: II, 457.

lavori che si chiamano Tedeschi, the style of which "was invented by the Goths."⁷ (3) In John Evelyn's *Account of Architects and Architecture*, 1697, we find a two-fold origin, and two incongruous aberrations, attributed to the "Gothic" style.⁸

It is the ancient *Greek and Roman Architecture* which is here intended, as most entirely answering those Perfections required in a faultless and accomplished Building; such as for so many Ages were so renowned and reputed by the universal Suffrages of the civilized World, and would doubtless have still subsisted, and made good their claim, and what is recorded of them, had not the *Goths, Vandals* and other barbarous Nations subverted and demolished them, together with that glorious Empire, where those stately and pompous Monuments stood; introducing in their stead, a certain fantastical and licentious Manner of Building, which we have since called *Modern* (or *Gothic* rather), Congestions of heavy, dark, melancholy and *Monkish Piles*, without any just Proportion, Use or Beauty, compared with the truly *Ancient*. So as when we meet with the greatest Industry, and expensive *Carving*, full of fret and lamentable *Imagery*, sparing neither of Pains nor Cost, a judicious Spectator is rather distracted and quite confounded, than touched with that admiration which results from the true and just *Symmetry*, regular Proportion, Union and Disposition, great and noble Manner, which those *August and Glorious Fabricks* of the Ancients still produce.

It was after the Irruption and Swarms of those truculent People from the *North*, the *Moors* and *Arabs* from the *South* and *East*, over-running the Civilized World, that wherever they fixed themselves, they soon began to debauch this noble and useful Art; when instead of those beautiful *Orders*, so majestically and proper for their Stations, becoming Variety, and other ornamental accessories, they set up those slender and misquise *Pillars*, or rather Bundles of *Staves*, and other incongruous Props to support incumbent Weights, and pondrous arched Roofs, without Entablature; and though not without great Industry, as M. D'Aviler well observes, nor altogether naked of gaudy *Sculpture*, trite and busy Carvings, it is such as rather gluts the Eye than gratifies and pleases it with any reasonable Satisfaction. [For example, let any Man of Judgment look] awhile upon *King Henry the Seventh's Chappel* at Westminster, . . . on its sharp *Angles, Jetties*, narrow *Lights*, lame *Statues, Lace*, and other *Cut-work* and *Crinkle-Crankle*. . . [In] the *Modern Architecture*, the universal and unreasonable Thickness of the Walls, clumsy *Buttresses, Towers*, sharp-pointed *Arches, Doors* and other *Apertures*, without proportion; non sensical Insertions of various *Marbles* impertinently placed; *Turrets* and *Pinnacles* thick set with *Monkies* and *Chymaeras* (and abundance of busy

⁷ *Vite*, 1807 ed., I, 254.

⁸ Prefixed to his edition of Roland Fréart's *A Parallel of the Ancient Architecture with the Modern*. The passage is cited from the fourth edition, 1733, pp. 9 ff.

Work and other Incongruities) dissipate and breake the Angles of the sight, and so confound it, that one cannot consider it with any Steadiness, where to begin or end; taking off from that noble Air and Grandure, bold and graceful Manner, which the Ancients had so well and so judiciously established.

The confusion of architectural ideas here is manifest. Evelyn, while assuming that both the "Goths" and the "Arabs" were responsible for the introduction of the "fantastical and licentious manner of building," gives the same name to the productions of both, and speaks as if the qualities which he condemns with such breathless vehemence were to be found together in the same structures. But it was plain to any eye that they were not. It is hard to conceive how anyone who had ever seen such churches as Salisbury Cathedral, the choir of Lincoln, the Sainte Chapelle, St. Ouen in Rouen, or King's College Chapel could possibly call them "congestions of heavy, dark, melancholy, monkish piles"; while it was equally inappropriate to describe such Norman buildings as Durham Cathedral or St. Bartholomew's the Great as "supported on slender and misquine pillars or bundles of staves," or as full of "lace and other cut-work." The essential difference, not merely in technical details but in spirit, between (at least) early Romanesque and what we call Gothic was evident, and the need for a distinction in terminology to express this difference began to be felt. The term usually adopted was determined by another erroneous historical hypothesis concerning the origin of true Gothic (in our sense). Thus Wren wrote in 1713, with reference to Henry III's additions to Westminster Abbey, that what "we now call the Gothick manner of architecture . . . should with more reason be called the Saracen style."⁹ Similarly the article "Architecture" in the *Encyclopédie* distinguishes "Gothic" style from that of the later Middle Ages. The former lasted only until the time of Charlemagne. Thereafter "France applied herself to the art with some success, . . . so that by degrees architecture, changing its aspect, fell into the opposite excess, by becoming too light (*légère*); the architects of this period made the beauties of the architecture consist in a delicacy and a profusion of ornament hitherto unknown; an excess into which they doubtless fell through opposition to the Gothic which had preceded them, or through a taste which they

⁹ *Parentalia*, 297.

had received from the Arabs and Moors, who had introduced this style into France from the Southern countries, as the Vandals and Goths had brought in from the Northern countries *le goût pesant et gothique*." In the middle and late eighteenth century this distinction became familiar, and the style which we call Gothic was commonly designated "Saracenic," "Arabic," or "Arabesque." So in J. F. Sobry's *De l'architecture*, 1776 (p. 201):

Les Arabes . . . nous apportèrent une nouvelle architecture. Cette architecture plus légère, plus ornée, plus simple, aussi solide et aussi facile à exécuter que la Gothique, fut reçue universellement; . . . et ces édifices, quoique rejetés aujourd'hui par le plus grand nombre, trouvent encore des admirateurs.

As a much later historian of architecture, Quatremère de Quincy, in the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, 1800, put it, "it has seemed to some critics that the bizarre style of this architecture in its ornaments and in the employment of its diverse forms, would lead one to regard it as an emanation of those countries in which *le goût irrégulier* has at all times fixed its empire—I mean Asia."¹⁰

Nevertheless, the same writers who, on occasion, distinguish "the Gothic" from "the Saracenic," sometimes continue to apply the former adjective to the latter style also, with or without the qualification "modern." Wren says of a part of old St. Paul's that it "was apparently of a more modern Gothick-stile, not with round (as in the old church) but sharp-headed arches,"¹¹ and the same nomenclature appears in the *Encyclopédie* (Art. "Gothique," vol. VII): there is an "ancient" and a "modern Gothic"; the latter is exemplified by Westminster Abbey and "la cathédrale de Litchfield." Fénelon had, however, called the style supposedly invented by the Arabs "l'architecture gothique" without qualification.

Let us, with these facts concerning the then current terminology in mind, try to determine the grounds on which Gothic was so generally condemned by late seventeenth and eighteenth century taste. The faults found in the "Gothic" (or "ancient Gothic") and the "Saracenic" (or "modern Gothic") styles, were, it is already

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, *Architecture*, vol. II, 455 ff.

¹¹ *Parentalia*, 1750, p. 272. In France the same distinction of "ancient and modern Gothic" had been made by J. F. Félibien des Avaux, *Recueil historique* . . . , 1687, préf.

evident, in the main precisely opposite faults. The former was rude, ponderous, stiff, sombre, depressing: "Gothic gloom" was one of the conventional descriptive phrases for characterizing its effect upon the mind. The latter was condemned as wanting in solidity, as too "light" and too soaring, as "frivolous" and "fanciful" and over-refined, as overladen with ornament, as confusing the eye with an excessive multiplicity of separate parts and obtrusive details. Perhaps the most reiterated charge, obviously directed against the "modern" rather than the "ancient Gothic," was that of over-ornateness; the glorifiers of the classic mode never tired of referring to "le fade goût des ornements gothiques" (Molière: *La Gloire du dôme du Val-de-Grâce*).¹² Fénelon writes in the *Lettre sur les occupations de l'Académie française* (chap. X):

Les inventeurs de l'architecture qu'on nomme *gothique*, et qui est, dit-on, celle des Arabes, crurent sans doute avoir surpassé les architectes grecs. Un édifice grec n'a aucun ornement qui ne serve qu'à orner l'ouvrage; . . . tout est simple, tout est mesuré, tout est borné à l'usage; on n'y voit ni hardiesse ni caprice qui impose aux yeux; les proportions sont si justes, que rien ne paraît fort grand, quoique tout le soit; tout est borné à contenter la vraie raison. Au contraire, l'architecte gothique élève sur des piliers très minces une voûte immense qui monte jusqu'aux nues; on croit que tout va tomber, mais tout dure pendant bien des siècles; tout est plein de fenêtres, de roses et de pointes; la pierre semble découpée comme du carton; tout est à jour, tout est en l'air. N'est-il pas naturel que les premiers architectes gothiques se soient flattés d'avoir surpassé, par leur raffinement, à la simplicité grecque?

The passage was stolen bodily by the writer of the article "Gothique" in the *Encyclopédie*, who added that "the principal characteristic" of this style is that of being "chargé d'ornements qui n'ont ni goût ni justesse." It is evident from these and other passages that the ill repute of Gothic (*i. e.*, "Saracenic") in general was in part due to a valid aesthetic reaction against the excesses of the English Late Perpendicular and the French Flamboyant styles; but the attributes found in an extreme form in these were commonly ascribed to "modern Gothic" as a whole.

1. The gravest indictment in eighteenth century eyes was thus, apparently, that brought against the "modern Gothic" of the thir-

¹² Cf. Félibien des Avaux, *Recueil historique*, préf.: The "modern Gothic" architects "ont passé dans un aussi grand excès de délicatesse, que les autres avoient fait dans une extrême pesanteur et grossièreté."

teenth to the fifteenth centuries. Its chief offenses, by classical standards, were those indicated in the passages just cited: its want of a rational "simplicity and plainness" and the introduction of ornament without use or structural necessity. The beauty of a Grecian temple, said Berkeley in *Alciphron* (I, 3), "ariseth from the appearance of use, or the imitation of natural things whose beauty is originally founded in the same principle. Which is, indeed, the grand distinction between Grecian and Gothic architecture: the latter being fantastical, and for the most part being founded neither in nature nor reason, neither necessity nor use."¹³ It was, it is clear, the lack of an effect of simplicity, resulting from the multiplication of members, profusion of small details, absence of unbroken surfaces, that Addison had in mind when he spoke of the "meanness of manner" of a Gothic cathedral, in the passage in *Spectator*, No. 415, which seems, by our standards of taste, so astonishing.

Let anyone reflect on the disposition of mind in which he finds himself at his first entrance into the Pantheon at Rome . . . and consider how little in proportion he is affected with the inside of a Gothic Cathedral, though it be five times larger than the other; which can arise from nothing else but the Greatness of Manner in the one and the Meanness of Manner in the other.

The psychological explanation of this he finds in "*Monsieur Fréart's* Parallel of the Ancient and Modern Architecture,"¹⁴ which explains how "the same quantity of superficies" may seem "great and magnificent" or "poor and trifling"—the former if "the Division of the Principal Members of the Order consist of but few Parts," but all of these "great, and of a bold and ample Relievo"; the latter if "there is a Redundancy of these smaller Ornaments, which divide and scatter the Angels of the sight into a multitude of Rays, so pressed together that the whole will appear but a confusion."

Partly the same, partly a different attempt to explain psychologically what in Gothic is displeasing is offered by Montesquieu in his *Essai sur le goût*. This writing manifests some of the elements of the dawning 'romantic' taste; Montesquieu insists that—along with "order" and "symmetry"—"surprise," "variety," "con-

¹³ *Alciphron*, I, Dialogue 3.

¹⁴ Addison is, as his editors have noted, quoting from Evelyn's translation of Fréart's work.

trast" are among the chief sources of aesthetic enjoyment. But he is unwilling to grant that Gothic really possesses these excellences.

Gothic architecture appears to be very full of variety, but the confusion of the ornaments fatigues us by reason of their smallness, which prevents us from distinguishing one from another, and by reason of their number, of which the effect is that there is none upon which the eye can come to rest. Thus this architecture is displeasing in the very features of it which were designed to render it agreeable. A building in the Gothic order is a sort of enigma for the eye that looks upon it; and the mind is embarrassed, as when one puts before it an obscure poem.

But aside from any psychological theories of the aesthetics of architecture, the relative lack of "simplicity" regarded—on the whole justly—as characteristic of Gothic was bound to be condemned by an early eighteenth-century classicist for another reason; it was in conflict with his most sacred catchword. To want simplicity was to fail in "conformity to nature." This was, of course, the supreme criterion of excellence applied then, as in the two preceding centuries, to everything from religion to the construction of cowsheds; and it was on the ground of its greater "naturalness" (in certain of the senses of that protean term) that classical architecture had been extolled by its orthodox eulogists. La Bruyère in *Les Caractères* ("Des Ouvrages de l'esprit") not only illustrates the identification of "classic" with "natural," but also argues that the architects had first set the example which ought to be followed in literary style:

On a dû faire du style ce qu'on a fait de l'architecture: on a entièrement abandonné l'ordre gothique que la barbarie avait introduit pour les palais et pour les temples; on a rappelé le dorique, l'ionique et le corinthien, . . . Combien de siècles se sont écoulés avant que les hommes, dans les sciences et les arts, aient pu revenir au goût des anciens et reprendre enfin le simple et le naturel.

The same equation—natural = simple = classic—with the same parallel between architectural and poetic style appears again in *Spectator*, No. 62, where Addison likens Gothic designers to poets who seek to manifest their "wit" by introducing conceits—elaborate and far-fetched metaphors—or other ingenuities and complexities, instead of making "a thought shine in its own natural beauties. Poets who want this Strength of Genius to give that majestic simplicity to Nature, which we so much admire in the Works of the Ancients, are forced to hunt after foreign Orna-

ments, and not to let any piece of Wit of what kind soever escape them. I look upon these writers as Goths in Poetry, who like those in Architecture, not being able to come up to the beautiful Simplicity of the old Greeks and Romans, have endeavored to supply its place with all the extravagances of an irregular fancy." And having the support of "so great an authority as Mr. Dryden," Addison "ventures to observe, That the taste of most of our English poets, as well as readers, is extremely Gothick." So, later in the century, in some aesthetic observations of Shenstone's. We value things, he says, because of their "natural production," or the appearance of it, and this is why we do not "view with pleasure the labored carvings and futile diligence of Gothic artists. We view with much more satisfaction some plain Grecian fabric, where art, indeed, has been equally but less visibly industrious."¹⁵ William Whitehead in *The World*, 1753, damned the Gothic on similar grounds. Writing satirically of "the reigning follies of this various island" which have arisen "under the name of our approaches to nature," he continues:

TASTE in my opinion, ought to be applied to nothing but what has as strict rules annexed to it, though perhaps imperceptible to the vulgar, as Aristotle, among the critics, or Domenichino, among the painters, would require. People may have whims, freaks, caprices, persuasions, and even second-sights, if they please; but they can have no TASTE which has not its foundation in nature, and which, consequently, may be accounted for. From a thousand instances of our imitative inclinations I shall select one or two, which have been, and still are, notorious and general. A few years ago everything was Gothic; our houses, our beds, our book-cases, and our couches were all copied from some parts or other of our old cathedrals. The Grecian architecture, . . . that architecture which was taught by nature and polished by the Graces, was totally neglected. Tricks and conceits got possession everywhere. Clumsy buttresses were to shock you with disproportion; or little pillars were to support vast weights; ignorant people, who knew nothing of gravity, were to tremble at their entrance to every building, lest the roofs should fall upon their heads. This, however odd it might seem, and however unworthy the name of TASTE, was cultivated, was admired, and still has its professors in different parts of England. There is something in it, they say, congenial to our old Gothic constitution; I should rather think, to our modern idea of liberty, which allows everyone the privilege of playing the fool, and of making himself ridiculous in whatever way he pleases.¹⁶

¹⁵ *Unconnected Thoughts on Gardening*, in *Works*, 1764, II, 143.

¹⁶ *The World*, No. 12. The passage is of special interest, not only as testimony as to the currency of the new Gothic mode before 1753, but as

Thus the classicist revolt against Gothic architecture was itself, as interpreted by eighteenth-century theorists, a "return to Nature." The error of the Gothic architects was that they had deviated too widely from "Nature's simple plan"; while, in the words of the *Encyclopédie* (art. "Architecture"), the architects of the Renaissance in France and Italy "applied themselves to recapturing *la première simplicité, la beauté et la proportion, de l'ancienne architecture.*"¹⁷

2. If the "modern Gothic" erred perhaps even more than the "ancient" in its departure from the simplicity of Nature, both styles stood indicted on another count: lack of symmetry. And in this also they were held to fail to "imitate nature." "Architecture," said D'Alembert in the *Discours préliminaire de l'Encyclopédie*, "is limited to imitating, by the grouping and combination of the different bodies which it employs, the symmetrical arrangement which nature more or less sensibly observes in each individual, and which contrasts so well with the beautiful variety of every whole." It should be observed, however, that the term "symmetry" did not necessarily mean for eighteenth-century critics merely bilateral uniformity. It is defined by Montesquieu in the *Encyclopédie* (art. "Goût"), after Vitruvius, as "the relations, proportions and regularity of parts necessary to produce a beautiful whole"; and its nature, and a psychological theory as to why it is indispensable, are suggested in the same article. The "general rule" is laid down that "any object which we are to see *d'un coup d'oeil*" should have "symmetry," should be "simple and single and have all its parts related to the principal object." "Symmetry," in short, was a kind of simplicity; and the theory of it was that anything that militates against unity of effect, that produces upon the eye or the mind a distracting multiplicity of impressions which cannot be immediately recognized as forming a single well-defined pattern, is inconsistent with beauty and fails to give properly aesthetic pleasure. The demand for symmetry in architecture thus expressed the same fundamental psychological theory as the insistence upon the unities in the drama and the dis-

illustrating the connection, in some minds, between "Gothic irregularity" and moral individualism or political liberalism—the reverse of the association of ideas earlier noted.

¹⁷ This idea was attacked by Goethe in *Von deutscher Baukunst*, 1773.

approval of the mixture of *genres*. Bilateral repetition of the same forms was merely one of the principal means of producing this singleness of effect, or immediately obvious unity of design.

Now "symmetry" in the ordinary sense was, of course, not really disregarded by the Gothic designers, especially of churches; and in interiors it was often actually manifest in a high degree.¹⁸ That a lack of it seemed to eighteenth-century virtuosi and critics to be characteristic of the style was partly due to the historical accident that few great Gothic buildings were completed in accordance with the original designs. But this fact was little known or considered at the time. The conception of the style was derived from the actual visible aspect of many of its principal monuments; and thus the notions of symmetry and irregularity came to be firmly associated with the term "Gothic" in its architectural use.

3. For strict neo-classical theorists, however, "regularity" meant more than sensibly apparent symmetry and repetition of identical members; it implied the observance of uniform and exact mathematical rules of proportion, such as had been laid down by Vitruvius. Illustrations of this conception are abundant throughout the century. And here too the Gothic architects were found wanting; they were usually supposed to have designed by rule of the thumb or spontaneous inspiration. Thus Thomas Warton when in 1782, under the influence of Reynolds, he repented his former Gothicism, compared the Gothic

Builder's model, richly rude
By no Vitruvian symmetry subdued

with

the chaste design,
The just proportion and the genuine line

of classic art.¹⁹

All of the foregoing grounds of disparagement of Gothic architecture are interestingly summed up in Goethe's account of the

¹⁸ This fact was recognized by Hutcheson, and he accordingly granted that Gothic has "real beauty," though not the highest—inasmuch as it has in a limited degree the same attributes as the classical. (*Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, 1725, § 6; cited from third ed., 1729, p. 76.)

¹⁹ *Verses on Sir Joshua Reynold's Painted Window at New College, Oxford*, 1782.

preconceptions with which he first approached the Cathedral of Strasbourg in 1770:

Auf Hörensagen ehrte ich die Harmonie der Massen, die Reinheit der Formen, war ein abgesagter Feind der verworrenen Willkürlichkeiten gotischen Verzierungen. Unter die Rubrik Gotisch, gleich dem Artikel eines Wörterbuches, häufte ich alle synonymische Misverständnisse, die mir von Unbestimmtem, Ungeordnetem, Unnatürlichem, Zusammengestopfeltem, Aufgeflicktem, Überladnem jemals durch den Kopf gezogen waren.²⁰

4. The neo-classic criterion of universal acceptability was sometimes invoked for the disparagement of the Gothic, as in the familiar lines addressed to Reynolds by Thomas Warton in the same poem:

Thy powerful hand has broke the Gothic chain,
And brought my bosom back to truth again.
To truth by no peculiar taste confined,
Whose universal pattern strikes mankind.

The criterion was obviously, in this case, even more illogically applied than in the case of literature; for, by the eighteenth-century reckoning, all European mankind had preferred for some eight hundred years or more to build "Gothic" structures, while the Greek and Roman modes, so far as was known, had prevailed only a few centuries longer. There was thus no historical support for the supposition that the one was "universal" while the other was not. The notion expressed in Warton's lines was not, I think, one which had much part in producing the disapproval of Gothic architecture, or even in the 'rationalization' of this attitude. There was a conventional association between the idea of "the classic" and the idea of that of which the validity and beauty is recognized by all men of all races and all types at all times; and since Gothic structures were *not* "classic"—in the sense of accordant with Greek or Roman models—it was, by a mere verbal confusion, assumed by Warton that they were less "classic," in the sense of "universally approved or enjoyed," than the creations of Palladio or his imitators.

Such were the four principal preconceptions which it was necessary to overcome before Gothic could gain the approval of those for whom the first rule of all art was that it should "imitate" or "conform to Nature."

²⁰ *Werke*, Jubiläumsausgabe, XXXIII, 7.

A renewal of Gothic building had begun in England upon a considerable scale before the dogma of the inferiority of Gothic was seriously challenged. This was the consequence of a new sense on the part of architects of what "harmony" of style required. Many builders since the sixteenth century had without compunction plastered classical orders, pediments and arcades upon Gothic structures. But before the end of the seventeenth century it began to be felt by connoisseurs and designers that this was an impropriety. It was better that a building should be all in one style, even though that was a bad style, than that it should be a mixture of incongruous modes. Wren was an influential preacher of this principle. It is true that, in his proposals for restoring old St. Paul's before the fire, he declared that "it will be as easy to perform it after a good Roman manner, as to follow the Gothic rudeness of the old design." He proposed to put over the cross of the transepts of this Gothic structure "a spacious *dome* or *rotundo*, with a *cupola* or hemispherical roof, and upon the *cupola* a *lantern* with a spring top." But in the Memorial giving his plan for restoring Westminster Abbey he wrote:

I have made a design . . . still in the Gothic form, and of a style with the rest of the structure, which I would strictly adhere to, throughout the whole intention; to deviate from the old form would be to run into a disagreeable mixture, which no person of good taste could relish.²¹

When, therefore, his pupil and collaborator, Hawksmoor, and Kent, a designer immensely in the fashion in the time of the first two Georges, were called upon to complete or enlarge Gothic buildings, they commonly tried—seldom, it must be said, with much success—to adhere in some degree to the style of the original structure. We find Hawksmoor, for example, almost simultaneously building two college quadrangles at Oxford. At All Souls' the old front quadrangle remained; and Hawksmoor designed (about 1721) for the new north court the dormitories with tall twin towers which latter-day critics have so much berated—the most conspicuous piece of eighteenth-century Gothic in Oxford. Hard by at Queen's, however, the college authorities, inopportunistly affluent, were willing to have their noble group of medieval buildings razed to the ground; and Hawksmoor showed in the present Italianate outer

²¹ *Parentalia*, p. 302.

court and façade of that college what he preferred to do when given a free hand.

It is of this preliminary episode in the history of the Gothic revival that we get an amusing glimpse in the third book of Mason's *The English Garden* (1779). The hero of the tale had inherited a Gothic castle from his ancestors—a mansion whose “turrets, spires and windows”

Bespoke its birth
Coëval with those rich Cathedral fanes
(Gothic ill-named).

But having a Gothic dwelling, he must also have a Gothic barn, cowyard, and dovecote, and an imitation ruined abbey to conceal the ice-house.²²

The fane conventual there is dimly seen,
The mitred windows and the cloister pale,
With many a wandering column; ivy soon
Round the rude chinks her net of foliage spreads.

Yet even Mason's hero, with all his zeal for the Gothic, could not, it must be admitted, refrain from mixing the styles. Mason himself, in a prose passage, carried the argument farther, and suggested that “harmony” generally required Gothic buildings in England, since so much of the existing architecture, especially in country places, was in that style.

Occasional expressions of an actual admiration, or even preference, for Gothic appear in the 1720s and 1730s; but the movement for the actual building of new structures in what was supposed to be this style apparently takes its start in the early forties. Batty Langley's *Ancient Architecture Restored and Improved by a Great Variety of Usefull Designs, Entirely New, in the Gothick Mode, for the Ornamenting of Buildings and Gardens* appeared in 1742 and his *Gothick Architecture Improved by Rules and Proportions* in 1747. To the former work is prefixed a list of 114 “Encouragers to the Restoring of the Saxon Architecture”—presumably the subscribers to the volume—ranging from a large company of dukes and earls to smiths and carpenters. Langley did not hesitate to declare that “the best Gothic buildings in *Magnificence* and *Beauty* greatly exceed all that have been done by both Greeks and Romans.” With all his errors of taste and understanding,

²² *The English Garden*, III (1779), 59 ff.

Langley must be accorded a place of some consequence in the history of aesthetic fashions and in the preparation for the Romantic medievalism, as the first professional architect, and perhaps the first English writer of his age, who boldly proclaimed, not merely the respectability of Gothic, but its actual superiority to classical architecture both "ancient" and "modern," and zealously endeavored to persuade his contemporaries to build in the Gothic style.

In this endeavor, however, he had a close second in Sanderson Miller. A country gentleman, a man of letters, and an antiquarian, Miller was a person of some importance in his day, whose name became all but forgotten until his correspondence with a pleasant circle of friends was resurrected in 1910.²³ Having first, in 1744, remodelled his own ancestral seat of Radway Grange into what he conceived to be a more truly Gothic character, he was thereafter induced by many of the nobility and gentry to make similar improvements on their estates. Between 1745 and 1750 we find him designing numerous houses, church-towers, stables, *etc.*, in the new-old style; and he seems to have been especially in demand as a designer of ruins. One of his admirers, Lord Dacre, writes him:

Your fame in Architecture grows greater and greater every day, and I hear of nothing else. . . . You'll soon eclipse Mr. Kent, especially in the Gothic way, in which to my mind he succeeds very ill.²⁴

By the late seventeen-forties, then, a Gothic revival—marked, it is true, by more enthusiasm than discrimination—was in full swing; as early as 1753 we have found it spoken of as an old story.²⁵ It was in domestic structures rather than in churches that the new enthusiasm oftenest found expression; and it seems to have raged especially in the construction of small outbuildings, forming a part rather of the landscape than of the architectural design. On the grounds of Envil, for example, there was a "Gothic billiard-room," designed by Miller; and we even hear of a "Gothic cock-pit." This limitation in the scope afforded the new Gothic builders was doubtless mainly due to the fact that the great official appointments were still usually held by architects of the older school. That the supreme examples of the possibilities of Gothic

²³ *An Eighteenth-Century Correspondence*, ed. by Lilian Dickins and Mary Stanton.

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, 275.

²⁵ Cf. also Walpole's *Letters*, III, 187.

were to be found in the medieval churches seems, however, to have been clearly enough recognized.

It is true that this neo-Gothicism of the middle of the century apparently did not persist in full vigor, and that some of its most celebrated adherents afterwards wholly or partially abjured their early faith. Into the reasons for this I shall not here inquire. The fact remains that the break with the classical tradition in architecture had been made; and the reaction was destined to be but a temporary one.

The question which interests the student of the history of ideas concerns the reasons for this change of taste in architecture and kindred arts of design. All such changes, no doubt, owe much to the natural craving for variety and novelty, and to the need of feeling oneself superior in taste to one's immediate forebears, which has periodically characterized the passing generations of Occidental mankind. There is some truth, too, in the philosophy of the history of art which Professor Grierson has propounded—*viz.*, that the human mind inevitably goes through a recurrent alternation of "classical" and "romantic" phases (though I think this an unhappy use of the terms), the former being periods in which men for a time rest content—unquestioning, self-confident, and like-minded—in some established synthesis, while the latter are the periods in which it is discovered afresh that every "synthesis effected by the human mind involves exclusions and sacrifices," that "all balances in human life are precarious," and that an attempt to frame a new and more comprehensive synthesis has become imperative.²⁶ But (aside from other possible criticisms) no such general explanations help us to understand why *particular* innovating movements took the specific directions which they did, or occurred at the times at which they did occur. Even though it be assumed that in "the systole and diastole of the human heart" a revolutionary period in art was due to begin in the second quarter of the eighteenth century, why should this have had as one of its earliest manifestations a new appreciation of the qualities found in medieval architecture and a tendency to imitate (at first by no means successfully) medieval models.

²⁶ H. J. C. Grierson: *Classical and Romantic*, 1923. Mr. Grierson has merely invented a new and confusing terminology for Comte's antithesis of "organic" and "transitional" periods.

What I suggest as a partial answer to this question is that this new appreciation of Gothic—not merely in England in the 1740s and 50s but in its later eighteenth-century manifestations also—was made possible by the supposed discovery that this style in architecture was really more “natural,” more “in conformity with Nature,” than the classical—in other words, by certain changes in ideas which enabled the “Goths” to steal the classicists’ catchword. For the sacred though happily equivocal formula remained unchanged throughout; if it had not been possible plausibly to regard Gothic as a true “imitation of Nature” it could hardly have gained any wide acceptance in the eighteenth century. What may be called the necessary “naturalizing” of Gothic, however, took place chiefly in two ways, one of minor consequence, the other of great importance in the general history of aesthetic ideas and taste.

1. We find early in the century occasional suggestions that a Gothic interior is a sort of indoor equivalent of a much admired feature of an English garden or of a natural landscape. In his *Itinerarium Curiosum*, 1724, William Stukeley, a pioneer tourist, wrote, after visiting the cloisters of Gloucester Cathedral:

Nothing could have made me so much in love with Gothic Architecture (so-called), and I judge for a gallery, library, or the like, 'tis the best manner of building because the idea of it is taken from a walk of trees, whose touching heads are curiously imitated by the roof.²⁷

The idea was elaborated in a note to one of Pope's *Epistles* by Bishop Warburton:

When the Goths had conquered Spain, . . . they struck out a new species of architecture, unknown to Greece and Rome; upon original principles, and ideas much nobler than what had given birth to classical magnificence. For this northern people having been accustomed, during the gloom of Paganism, to worship the Deity in groves, . . . when their new religion required edifices they ingeniously projected to make them resemble groves as nearly as the distance of architecture would admit. . . . And with what skill and success they executed the project . . . appears from hence, that no attentive person ever viewed a regular avenue of well-grown trees, intermixing their branches overhead, but it presently put him in mind of the long vista through the Gothic cathedral. . . .

This became a widely accepted commonplace; Sobry writes (*op. cit.*, 1776, p. 28):

²⁷ Cited in *An Eighteenth-Century Correspondence*, p. 262.

La colonne Arabesque, et le pilier de cette Ordonnance, représentent plusieurs arbres liés ensemble et élancés, dont les branchages forment les arrêtes des voûtes . . . Les chambranles de cette ordre dérivent de la même idée. Ce sont les branchages qui accompagnent l'ouverture des portes et des fenêtres.

This idea that the Gothic style had actually originated in such a direct imitation of Nature was still among the hypotheses which Quatremère de Quincy thought it necessary to examine and refute in 1800. Some, he writes, "either repeating what Warburton said, or hitting upon the same idea themselves, have imagined Gothic architecture to be a fantastic system of imitation—i. e., of a forest or of an *allée de jardin*. These writers conceive that the Gothic architects proposed to themselves, in the interiors of their churches, *une aussi puérile singerie*." Such theorists had, of course, Quatremère points out, merely taken an accidental effect for a cause: "at all times and in all architectures there are to be found resemblances with objects which never had served as their models."²⁸ Schelling, however, a few years later, elaborating upon the theme that "die Architektur hat vorzugweise den Pflanzenorganismus zum Vorbild," still held to the Warburtonian theory, declaring a Gothic building to be essentially a "huge tree or row of trees," and elaborating the parallel in even greater detail.²⁹ Partly for this reason, Schelling rejected "the now customary opinion that the Saracens brought this architectural style with them into the Occident," and claimed for it a native German origin.

Wenn Deutschland in den ältesten Zeiten mit Wäldern bedeckt war, so lässt sich denken dass auch beim ersten Anfang der Zivilisation in der Bauart, vorzüglich der Tempel, die Deutschen das alte Vorbild ihre Wälder nachgeahmt haben, dass auf diese Weise die gotische Baukunst in Deutschland ursprünglich heimisch war, und von da aus sich vorzüglich nach Holland und England verpflanzte.

Thus "die gotische Baukunst ist ganz naturalistisch, roh, blosse unmittelbare Nachahmung der Natur."³⁰ Schelling did not himself, it is true, see in this a reason for preferring Gothic to classical architecture; for like most of the German Romanticists, he was not in the main a primitivist or a "naturalist" in matters of

²⁸ *Encyclopédie méthodique: Architecture*, II, 459.

²⁹ *Philosophie der Kunst*, first delivered as lectures in 1802-3; in *Schelling's Werke*, herausgegeben von O. Weiss, 1907, III, 232-3.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 234.

aesthetics—or of ethics.³¹ The (supposedly) more highly developed forms of this art he regarded as superior to its crudely “natural” forms; “harmony,” which is “the ruling part of architecture” depends upon “proportions or ratios”; and “the Ionic order has this attribute in the highest degree.”³² Nevertheless, in the passage cited he was expressing a conception of the nature and origin of Gothic still current in his time; and it was in this conception that some of his contemporaries and his eighteenth-century predecessors who *did* believe in the “unmittelbare Nachahmung der Natur” found an argument in justification of their enthusiasm for Gothic.

Another theory of the origin of Gothic (advanced by some of its admirers) which is mentioned by Quatremère brings it into accord with “Nature” by tracing it back to “the structure of the dwellings of primitive man.” “From the fact that it is agreed with respect to certain architectures that they had, in a certain type of primitive construction and in the characteristics of the dwellings which necessity suggested in the infancy of societies, a sort of model or type which imitation perfected in succeeding ages, it has been maintained that the Gothic architecture must in like manner have had in Nature its model and the type which it imitated.” This also Quatremère refutes at length, arriving at the opposite conclusion that *le gothique serait né non dans l'enfance mais dans la décrépitude de l'état social*.³³

2. Much more significant, however, than these simple parallels between Gothic forms and actual natural objects or primitive dwellings was the transfer of the aesthetic *principle of irregularity*—as a newly discovered implication of the rule of “imitating Nature”—from the art in which it had first manifested itself on a great scale—that of laying out gardens—to architecture. This transition Burke expressly remarked in 1757; and he added the interesting suggestion that the prior vogue of the formal garden had been due to an improper intrusion of architectural ideas into the designing of landscapes—that is to say, of man into Nature. For the idea that beauty results from certain proportions between the parts of objects, he declared, was never drawn from a study of nature.

³¹ On this cf. the writer's “On the Discrimination of Romanticisms,” *PMLA*, XXXIX (1924), 242-251.

³² *Op. cit.*, 242-3.

³³ *Encyclopédie méthodique: Architecture*, II, 459-460.

I am the more fully convinced that the patrons of proportion have transferred their artificial ideas to nature, and not borrowed from thence the proportions they use in works of art; because in any discussion of this subject they always quit as soon as possible the open field of natural beauties, the animal and vegetable kingdoms, and fortify themselves within the artificial lines and angles of architecture. . . . But nature has at last escaped from their discipline and their fetters; and our gardens, if nothing else, declare we begin to feel that mathematical ideas are not the true measure of beauty.³⁴

But if aesthetic principles derived from architecture had previously invaded gardening, in Burke's time the reverse process was going on; aesthetic ideas first developed and popularized in the latter art were being carried back into architecture. And in this, I suggest, lies a large part of the explanation of the first Gothic revival in actual architectural design, and of the new appreciation of England's glorious heritage of medieval Gothic buildings. For the qualities which had long been regarded as the characteristic deformities of Gothic art were, in great part, precisely those which it had now become the fashion to deem the highest virtues in garden design. What everybody was supposed to know was that Gothic architecture was characterized by a kind of wildness and irregularity. Horace Walpole in the *Anecdotes of Painting*, in a passage in which his earlier Gothic enthusiasm has diminished though by no means wholly evaporated, writes that "it is difficult for the noblest Grecian temple to convey half so many impressions to the mind as a cathedral does of the best Gothic taste." This he sets down to the credit not primarily of the architects but of the ecclesiastics, who "exhausted their knowledge of the passions in composing edifices whose pomp, mechanism, vaults, tombs, painted windows, gloom and perspectives, infused such sensations of romantic devotion; and they were happy in finding artists capable of executing such machinery. One must have taste to be sensible of the beauties of Grecian architecture; one only wants passions to feel Gothic." In a later note Walpole explains that he had intended to ascribe "more address to the architects of Gothic churches than to those of St. Peter's, not as architects but as politicians. . . . Gothic churches infuse superstition—Grecian, admiration. . . . I certainly do not mean by this little contrast to make any comparison between the rational beauties of regular architecture, and the unrestrained

³⁴ *Sublime and Beautiful*, Pt. III, § 4.

licentiousness of that which is called Gothic." "Yet," he cannot refrain from adding, "I am clear that the persons who executed the latter had much more knowledge of their art, more taste, more genius, and more propriety than we choose to imagine."³⁵

But in the art of the landscape-architect, we have seen, a kind of aesthetic licentiousness, a "lovely wildness" and irregularity had come to be a merit; and regularity, symmetry, proportion, passed for violations of the first and great commandment, to 'follow Nature.' And it seemed legitimate to assume that characteristics which are the supreme excellences of one art cannot be defects in another. It had, it is true, for a time been remarked that the principles of gardening and architecture are opposed. One of the earliest of English writers on architecture, Wotton, 1624, noted "a certain contrariety between buildings and gardening; for as fabrics should be regular, so gardens should be irregular, or at least cast into a very wild regularity."³⁶ This distinction was accepted by several eighteenth-century enthusiasts for the "natural garden."³⁷ But the cleavage between the two arts—however sound in principle—could not, in the actual movement of taste and opinion, be rigidly or lastingly maintained. Aesthetic ideas and, still more, aesthetic susceptibilities learned in one field inevitably passed over into the other. The transfusion might, of course, be in either direction: in which direction depended partly upon the relative position of the arts in the interest of theorists and connoisseurs, partly upon the natural sequence of stages in the working out of the implications of the aesthetic imperative *naturam sequere*. The influence in the seventeenth century, as we have seen, was from architecture to gardening—and hence unfavorable to Gothic. But when, through the example of the English garden and the enthusiastic preaching of its admirers, a whole generation had learned to find there a "beauty in irregularity," some were sure to better their instruction and seek for the same beauty elsewhere. Many, no doubt, had always in fact experienced pleasure in long-drawn aisles and fretted vaults and soaring pinnacles and broken sky-lines; but no man of taste could permit himself to give way to

³⁵ *Op. cit.*, 1849 ed., I, 117 f.

³⁶ *Reliquiae Wottonianae*, 4th ed., p. 64.

³⁷ *E. g.*, by Mason (*English Garden*, I, l. 395). his annotator Burgh, and Heely (*Beauties of Hagley*, I, 21).

this. Now, however, it could be argued upon accepted aesthetic principles that the recognized attributes of Gothic were legitimate sources of enjoyment. The doctrine of what may be called the primacy of irregularity was no longer limited to the theory of landscape-design, but was explicitly generalized.

Regularity and exactness [says a writer of the 1740s] excite no pleasure in the imagination unless they are made use of to contrast with something of an opposite kind. . . . Thus a regular building perhaps gives us little pleasure; and yet a fine rock, beautifully set off in *claro-obscuro*, and garnished with flourishing bushes, ivy, and dead branches, may afford us a great deal; and a ragged ruin, with venerable old oaks, and pines nodding over it, may perhaps please the fancy yet more.³⁸

Batty Langley, it is true—such errors are frequent with pioneers—had endeavored to commend Gothic by dwelling upon the “rules and proportions” to be found in some features of the style—*i. e.*, by assimilating it so far as possible to the older standards. But this notion was unconvincing and apparently made little impression. The effective way to vindicate the style was to declare, as did Mason, that in it “harmony results From disunited parts.” The merit of his hero’s Gothic dwelling was that in it

No modern art

Had marred with misplaced symmetry the pile.

The true spirit of the Gothic enthusiast, in short, was that expressed by a friend of Sanderson Miller’s who wrote in 1753 requesting a design for a new house:

I would by no means have my Front regular: . . . since the Beauty of Gothick architecture (in my opinion) consists, like that of a Pindarick Ode, in the Boldness and Irregularity of its Members.³⁹

The excellence of the so-called “Chinese sharawaggi”—the term being applied first to gardens but later to buildings also—as the eighteenth-century admirers of it held, was essentially the same; it was a beauty, or at least a pleasurable aesthetic quality, which did *not* depend upon the recognition, at all events at the first glance, of a single general scheme of arrangement in which the position of each part was “regular,” *i. e.*, manifestly determined

³⁸ W. Gilpin: *A Dialogue upon the Gardens . . . at Stow in Buckinghamshire*, 1748.

³⁹ *An Eighteenth-Century Correspondence*, p. 303.

by the recognizable nature of the scheme as a whole. *Sharawaggi* was beauty without regularity and without immediately apparent design.⁴⁰ It was for this reason that the Chinese and Gothic modes were so often associated in the eighteenth-century mind.

The customary parallel of architectural and poetic styles tended, as the revolt against the classical models grew, to promote the same identification of natural irregularity with aesthetic excellence in all the arts; and the three changes in taste which were developing at the same time gave one another mutual support. A taste for English or Chinese gardens, for Gothic buildings, and for Shakespeare, were often regarded as fundamentally the same taste; from the validity of any one a justification for either or both the others was sometimes deduced; and the ultimate theoretical ground for all three was the same assumption that art must have the attributes which distinguish the works of "Nature" and constitute a truly "natural" beauty—"Nature," however, being used, not in the classicist's sense but in the diametrically opposite sense. This is illustrated in the two most celebrated of English eighteenth-century characterizations of Shakespeare. Pope—who in theory though not in practice was something of a pioneer in all three of the new movements—begins his *Preface* (1725), it will be remembered, by a recital of the "characteristic excellencies for which (notwithstanding his defects) Shakespeare is justly and universally elevated above all other dramatic writers"; and the first and most fundamental of these is his closeness to nature.

Homer himself drew not his art so immediately from the fountains of Nature . . . [Shakespeare] is not so much an imitator as an instrument of Nature; and it is not so just to say that he speaks from her as that she speaks through him.⁴¹

And the *Preface* ends with a parallel between a Shakespearean play and a Gothic building: both have the same merits and the same defects.

I will conclude by saying of Shakespeare, that with all his faults, and with all the irregularity of his drama, one may look upon his works, in

⁴⁰ Cf. Sir William Temple: "Upon the Gardens of Epicurus; or of Gardening", 1685 (*Collected Works*, 1690, II, ii, 58); and Y. Z. Chang, "A Note on Sharawaggi", *MLN*, XLV (1930), 221-224.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, in *Works*, Elwin and Courthope ed., x, 535. Addison had said much the same thing in *Spectator*, No. 592.

comparison with those that are more finished and regular, as upon an ancient majestic piece of Gothic architecture compared with a neat modern building; the latter is more elegant and glaring, but the former is more strong and more solemn. It must be allowed, that in one of these there are materials enough to make many of the other. It has much the greater variety, and much the nobler apartments; though we are often conducted to them by dark, old, and uncouth passages. Nor does the whole fail to strike us with greater reverence, though many of the parts are childish, ill-placed, and unequal to its grandeur.⁴²

Forty years later Dr. Johnson in his *Preface to Shakespeare* condones and even extols Shakespeare's "irregularity" on the ground that Nature itself is irregular and "gratifies the mind with endless diversity," and is for just these reasons the more pleasing and the more sublime. In these passages the two most eminent English spokesmen of neo-classical aesthetic doctrine may be seen in the act of giving away the key to the classicists' position, by shifting the aesthetic connotation of "conformity to nature" from simplicity to complexity and from regularity to irregularity; and in doing so they at the same time assert, even though with reservations, the excellence, and even the superiority, of the recognized examples of the latter qualities in architecture, in landscape, and in the drama.

As the foregoing passages illustrate, the same reversal of valuation took place with respect to the attribute of "variety" as with respect to "irregularity." The classicists in architecture (examples have already been cited) had complained that there was too much variety in Gothic structures, that their ornament was too diverse and profuse, their carvings full of "fret and lamentable imagery." But when so respectable an aesthetic authority as Addison had declared the great beauty of natural landscapes to consist in the fact that in them "the eye is fed with an infinite variety of images without any certain stint or measure," the architectural corollary was certain sooner or later to be drawn. Walpole complained in 1750 of Grecian architecture that "the variety is little and admits no charming irregularities."⁴³ When Goethe in 1770 found his anti-Gothic prejudices falling from him at his first acquaintance with a great Gothic church, he gave as one of the principal causes of the impression thus made upon him,

die grossen harmonischen Massen, zu unzählig kleinen Teilen belebt, wie

⁴² *Ibid.*, 549.

⁴³ *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, II, 433.

in Werken der ewigen Natur bis aufs geringste Zäferchen, alles Gestalt, und alles Zweckend zum Ganzen.⁴⁴

But in his later, classicist phase, after his Italian journey, Goethe reverted to the sort of criticism of Gothic which we have seen in Fréart, Evelyn and Addison:

Leider suchten alle nordischen Kirchenverzierer ihre Grösse nur in der multiplizierten Kleinheit. Wenige verstanden diese kleinlichen Formen unter sich ein Verhältnis zu geben; und dadurch wurden solche Ungeheuer wie der Dom in Mailand, wo man einen ganzen Marmorberg mit ungeheuren Kosten versetzt und in die elendsten Formen gezwungen hat.⁴⁵

These two aspects of Gothic—"variety," consisting largely in the multiplication of divisions and of minute ornaments, and "irregularity"—were well summed up later in the century by a notable contributor to the diffusion in his own time of the taste both for naturalness in gardens and for medieval architecture:

In Gothic buildings the outline of the summit presents such a variety of forms, some open, some fretted and variously enriched, that even where there is an exact correspondence of parts, it is often disguised by an appearance of splendid confusion and irregularity. In the doors and windows of Gothic churches, the pointed arch has as much variety as any regular figure can well have, the eye is not so strongly conducted from the top of one to that of the other, as by the parallel lines of the Grecian; and every person must be struck with the extreme richness and intricacy of some of the principal windows of our cathedrals and ruined abbeys.⁴⁶

"Richness and intricacy" were precisely the qualities which the architectural classicists had professed most to disapprove. The same attributes were declared by Friedrich Schlegel to be the very essence of Gothic and its supreme merit; it is an art which is true to Nature because it produces the same impression of "inexhaustible fullness" and diversity of forms that Nature itself does: "Das Wesen der gotischen Baukunst besteht in der natürlichen Fülle und Unendlichkeit der innern Gestaltung und äussern blumenreichen Verzierungen."⁴⁷

⁴⁴ *Werke*, Jubiläumsausgabe, vol. 33, p. 9; italics mine.

⁴⁵ *Werke*, Jubiläumsausgabe, vol. 33, p. 47. Cf. the *Einleitung zum Propyläen*, 1798. "Dem deutschen Künstler, so wie überhaupt jedem neuern und nordischen, ist es schwer, ja beinahe unmöglich, von dem Formlosen zur Gestalt überzugehen" (*ibid.*),

⁴⁶ Uvedale Price: *An Essay on the Picturesque*, 1794, p. 51.

⁴⁷ *Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst*, 1805, in *Sämmtl. Werke*, VI, 201.

Both these qualities were closely related to another attribute—the suggestion of infinity—which had likewise been much insisted upon by those who had set forth the theory of the English garden. This note also had been sounded by Addison; it was thus expanded by a later English writer, Gilpin:

There is nothing so distasteful to the eye as a confined prospect (where the reasonableness of it does not appear) . . . The eye naturally loves liberty, and when it is in quest of prospects will not rest content with the most beautiful dispositions of art, confined within a narrow compass, but (as soon as the novelty of the sight is over) will begin to grow dissatisfied, till the whole limits of the horizon be given it to range through.⁴⁸

The Abbé Delille was apparently paraphrasing these passages when he observed that "the eye loves an air of liberty":

Laissez donc des jardins la limite indécise . . .
Où l'œil n'espère plus, le charme disparaît.⁴⁹

The appreciation of this quality was strengthened by the vogue of Burke's Essay: "Nothing," he wrote, "can strike the mind with its greatness which does not make some sort of approach towards infinity; which nothing can do whilst we are able to perceive its bounds."⁵⁰ But it was observed—though not, perhaps, until somewhat later in the century—that in this, too, Gothic rather than classical architecture came nearer to producing the aesthetic impression given by English gardens and by "Nature" itself. It produced it partly by its variety and profusion of detail, but partly by a special peculiarity of Gothic design which Bernardin de St. Pierre, among others, pointed out. "L'architecture gothique de nos temples affectait le sentiment de l'infini":

Les voûtes élevées, supportées par des colonnes sveltes, présentaient, comme la cime des palmiers, une perspective aérienne et céleste qui nous remplit d'un sentiment religieux. L'architecture grecque, au contraire, malgré la régularité de ses ordres et la beauté de ses colonnes, offre souvent dans ses voûtes un aspect lourd et terrestre, parcequ'elles ne sont pas assez élevées par rapport à leur largeur.⁵¹

By the end of the century this had become one of the familiar

⁴⁸ Gilpin, *On the Gardens at Stow*, 1748.

⁴⁹ *Des jardins*, 5th ed., p. 23.

⁵⁰ *Sublime and Beautiful*, Pt. II, § 4.

⁵¹ *Harmonies de la Nature*, written about 1793, published in 1814; in *Oeuvres posthumes*, 1833, p. 66.

themes of the enthusiasts for Gothic. "It is well known," wrote John Milner in 1800—quoting Burke as an authority—"that height and length are amongst the primary sources of the sublime . . . [Now in Gothic] the aspiring form of the pointed arches, the lofty pediments, the tapering pinnacles, the perspective of uniform columns, ribs and arches repeated at equal distances, produce an artificial infinite in the mind of the spectator, when the same extent of plain surface would perhaps hardly affect it at all."⁵² This, it will be observed, precisely contradicts the theory of Fréart adopted by Addison about the psychological effect of multiplicity of detail and broken surfaces.

The late Professor W. P. Ker has observed that "the Middle Ages have influenced modern literature more strongly through their architecture than through their poems. Gothic churches and old castles have exerted a medieval literary influence on many authors who have had no close acquaintance with old French and German poets and not much curiosity about their style. . . . The thrill of mystery and wonder came much more from Gothic buildings than from the *Morte d'Arthur*."⁵³ The truth of this is doubtless now generally recognized. Less familiar is the fact for which I have here presented some of the evidence—that the revival of an appreciation of medieval architecture, with its manifold consequences, was itself in great part an aspect of the eighteenth-century "return to Nature." But this "return" was in truth, as we have seen, rather a substitution of one for another way of conceiving of "Nature" as the norm and model of art.⁵⁴ The fundamental aesthetic formula of the neo-classicist was the fundamental formula of the gothicist; but the crucial word had reversed its meaning. This shift in the dominant connotation of "Nature" was partly, of course, the effect of a change in taste due to other causes; but it was also itself one of the apparent causes of that change, and it was pretty certainly a *conditio sine qua non*. Until very near the close of the century, hardly any reputable aesthetic

⁵² From Preface to *Essays on Gothic Architecture* by Warton, Bentham and Grose.

⁵³ *Cambridge History of English Literature*, x, p. 217.

⁵⁴ Cf. the writer's "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms": *PMLA*, xxxix, 242-251, and "Nature as Aesthetic Norm," *MLN*, xlii (1927), 444 ff.

theorist or connoisseur of the arts had the hardihood to blaspheme the sacred word; if the merits of Gothic were, in that age, to be vindicated, it must be by showing that type of art to be more faithful than its rival to the universally accepted standard. And the change in the conception of "naturalness" in art began, it is important to remember, before and independently of the beginning of medievalism in architecture. It began in the art in which it was most glaringly apparent that "conformity to Nature" is *not* consistent with formal and regular design, symmetry, simplicity, and the rest of the classical attributes. The earliest Gothic revival, that which took place in England, had for its herald and precursor the new fashion in the designing of artificial landscapes and the new liking for wildness, boldness, broken contours and boundless prospects in natural landscape. It was no accident that the principal early partisans of the *goût anglo-chinois* were among the principal early partisans of Gothic architecture. The one movement prepared the way for the other because it released the inhibitions which the neo-classic principles imposed, or were generally understood to impose, upon certain latent capacities for aesthetic enjoyment; and it did this the more effectively, because the more insidiously, by simply giving to the first and great commandment of the neo-classic code a profoundly different, yet a seemingly obvious and unavoidable, interpretation. Clad in the mantle of "Nature" the great art of the Middle Ages first regained aesthetic respectability; when it had done so, many other modes of medievalism followed in its train.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY

The Johns Hopkins University

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS ON THE PICTURESQUE

In his edition of Sir Joshua Reynolds' letters, Dr. Hilles quotes the Rev. William Gilpin's note that Sir Joshua had seen the essay "On Picturesque Beauty" in manuscript and had made some objections to it.¹ These objections Taylor printed in 1865, but not as a letter; and he implied that Reynolds wrote them after 1791.²

¹ Frederick Whiley Hilles, ed., *Letters of Sir Joshua Reynolds*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1929, pp. 217-219.

² Charles Robert Leslie and Tom Taylor, *Life and Times of Sir Joshua*

William Mason, enthusiastic about Gilpin's writings on picturesque beauty, submitted one of Gilpin's essays to his good friend Sir Joshua. Reynolds, much interested, in the course of a single evening read the essay and wrote a lengthy criticism. Mason then wrote to Gilpin:³

Curzon Street July 20th 1776

Dear Sir

I return you with this the three Essays; the first of wch I had an opportunity of leaving with Sr Joshua Reynolds at Richmond last Sunday evning, (without the Authors name) and on Monday morning he sent me his critique upon it, wch I also send you; it will prove, if it does nothing more, that he is certainly the Author of his own Academy-discourses, wch you know has been doubted. . . .

. . . should you be vext to find Sr Joshua not quite a friend to your systematical prose let it console you that he is still less a friend to my systematical verse, for you will find from his Paper that my principle of modern Gardening meets with no quarter from him. . . .

Gilpin years later sent Sir Joshua a revision of the essay, which, however, remained in essence as before. The artist replied very favorably. Gilpin announced to Mason, on June 29, 1791:

I have given ye Essays a thorough correction. As ye first was on a subject rather novel, I wished sir Joshua Reynolds to see it. A dozen years ago, if you remember, he saw it through yr means; & made objections to it. The general idea of it is still ye same. He now with great candour retracts his objections; & only points out to me an enlargement of my idea. However, as that supposes me to be acquainted with ye works of Raphael, & Michael Angelo, wh I am not, I must stop where I am. I intend to print sir Joshua's letter, as I hinted to him, & my answer, at ye end of ye essay.

Gilpin's *Three Essays* printed the new letter (which Hilles reprints), and also Gilpin's answer. But the death of Reynolds early in 1792 probably caused Gilpin to think again of the earlier, longer criticism in his possession: on March 21, 1792, he wrote to Mason:

Some years ago, when you shewed ye *first essay* to sir Joshua Reynolds, he wrote 8 or 9 quarto pages upon it. These papers I have by me; & tho

Reynolds, London, 1865, II, 606-608. The letter, though of considerable interest, seems to be very little known. It is given over to a discussion of the picturesque which, Reynolds maintains, is properly applicable "solely to the works of nature."

³ This and other quotations from Mason-Gilpin correspondence are taken from the manuscript letters, by permission of Mr. W. Lockwood M. Benson, a great-great-grandson of Gilpin.

he found fault with it in some parts, (wh^h fault you see he has now retracted,) yet there are several good things in it; & I think it might not be amiss to print it at ye end of ye essays—not in y^s edition, as it is too late—but in a future one. Do you see any objection?

Gilpin never printed Reynolds' early comments. The above-quoted correspondence shows them to be the body of a letter to William Mason in July, 1776; reveals that Reynolds was ready to consider at length the new artistic ideas of a theorist unknown to him; and indicates that he was able to write in a short time his own keen art-criticism,—or, in Mason's words, "that he is certainly the Author of his own Academy-discourses." This entire matter furthermore shows that Sir Joshua was a man willing to modify his ideas in the light of new thought, and to acknowledge his modifications; and this, together with passages in the Thirteenth Discourse,⁴ points to the conclusion that he, as other Englishmen, was as early as 1776 well aware of the new theories about landscape beauty set forth by William Gilpin.

WILLIAM D. TEMPLEMAN

University of Illinois

SWIFT'S BELIEF IN IMMORTALITY

Swift's belief in immortality has been specifically questioned by two of his biographers. Leslie Stephen writes: "But for Swift this state of mind carried with it the necessity of clinging to some religious creed, not because the creed held out promises of a better hereafter, for Swift was too much absorbed in the present to dwell much upon such beliefs."¹ And Churton Collins says: "Assuming as a Churchman the truth of Christianity he was bound also as a Churchman to assume the existence of a future state. But the evidence for supposing that it formed any article of his personal belief is slight."²

On the contrary, the promise of a better life beyond the grave was for Swift the solution of the troublesome problem of the unequal dispensations of blessings and discomforts in this existence.

⁴ *Discourses*, ed. Edmund Gosse, London, 1884, p. 243.

¹ *Life of Swift*, New York, 1882, E. M. L. series, p. 58.

² *Jonathan Swift*, London, 1893, p. 247.

To Mrs. Whiteway, who had lost a son by death, he wrote: "Some degree of wisdom is required in the greatest calamity; because God requires it; because He knows what is best for us; because He never intended anything like perfect happiness in the present life."³ In a prayer, also, offered at the death-bed of Stella he petitions: "Give her a true conception of the vanity, folly, and insignificance of all human things."⁴ To Gay he wrote: "Mr. Pope complains of seldom seeing you, but the evil is unavoidable, for different circumstances in life have always separated those whom friendship would join. God hath taken care of this to prevent any progress towards real happiness here, which would make life more desirable and death too dreadful."⁵ Writing to Stella from London about the death of Lady Ashburnham, who had died in child-birth, he said: "I hate life when I think it exposed to such accidents; and to see so many thousand wretches burdening the earth while such as she die, makes me think God did never intend life for a blessing."⁶

This view of life is dark, indeed, but it is illumined by the star of hope for a better hereafter. Praying by the dying Stella he said: "And if Thou wilt soon take her to Thyself, turn our thoughts rather upon that felicity which we hope she shall enjoy, than upon that unspeakable loss we shall endure."⁷ When Dr. Arbuthnot had written to him about his ill state of health, Swift replied: "You tear my heart with the ill state of your health; yet if it should please God to call you away before me, I should not pity you in the least, except on the account of what pains you might feel before you passed into a better life."⁸ When Mrs. Moore lost a daughter Swift offers her this comfort: "The dear person you lament is by no means an object of pity, either in a moral or religious sense. Philosophy always taught men to despise life as a most contemptible thing in itself; and religion regards it only as a preparation for a better, which you are taught to be certain that so innocent a person is now in possession of; so that she is an immense gainer, and you and her friends, the only losers."⁹ To Pope when his mother was ill he wrote: "As to poor Mrs. Pope, if she be still

³ *Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, ed. F. Elrington Ball, London, 1914, v, 309-310.

⁴ *Prose Works*, Bohn Edition, ed. Temple Scott, 1914, III, 314.

⁵ *Correspondence*, IV, 176.

⁶ *Prose Works*, II, 410.

⁸ *Correspondence*, v, 106.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III, 313.

⁹ *Ibid.*, III, 436.

alive, I heartily pity you and pity her. Her great piety and virtue will infallibly make her happy in a better life, and her great age has made her fully ripe for Heaven and the grave; and her best friends will most wish her eased of her labors, when she has so many good works to follow them."¹⁰ Writing to Pope at another time he said: "Pray God preserve Mrs. Pope for your sake and ease; I love and esteem her too much to wish it for her own. If I were five and twenty I would wish to be of her age to be as secure as she is of a better life."¹¹ To the Earl of Oxford whose daughter had died, he wrote: "My Lord, both religion and reason forbid me to have the least concern for that lady's death upon her own account, and he must be an ill Christian or a perfect stranger to her virtues who would not wish himself, with all submission to God Almighty's will, in her condition."¹²

These passages concerning immortality in general are supplemented by numerous ones bearing on the specific belief in rewards and punishments. He writes, for example, to Lady Masham: "Although you have not been rewarded suitably to your merits, I doubt not but God will make it up to you in another life, and to your children and posterity in this."¹³ In another prayer offered with heart-broken sincerity when Stella was dying occur these words: "O most merciful Father, Who never afflictest Thy children but for their own good, and with justice over which Thy mercy always prevaleth, either to turn them to repentance, or to punish them in the present life in order to reward them in a better, . . ."¹⁴ In the sermon on the *Testimony of Conscience*, answering possible objectors who say if conscience be so sure a director to us Christians in the conduct of our lives, how comes it to pass that the ancient heathen, who had no other lights but those of nature and reason, should so far excel us in all manner of virtue, he replies that they were extremely strict in their education of children, that they instilled love of country, and lastly, "the most considerable among the heathens did generally believe in rewards and punishments in a life to come, which is the great principle for conscience to work upon: Whereas too many of those who would be thought the most considerable among us, do both by their practices and their discourses, plainly affirm, that they believe nothing

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, IV, 90.¹¹ *Ibid.*, II, 87.¹² *Ibid.*, IV, 34.¹³ *Ibid.*, II, 222.¹⁴ *Prose Works*, III, 313.

at all of the matter."¹⁵ In the sermon *On the Wisdom of This World*, in speaking of the inferiority of the ancient philosophy to Christianity, he says: "It was the want of assigning some happiness proportioned to the soul of man, that caused many of them, either, on the one hand, to be sour and morose, supercilious and untreatable; or, on the other, to fall into the vulgar pursuits of common man. . . . So impossible is it for a man who looks no further than the present world to fix himself long in a contemplation where the present world has no part; he has no sure hold, no firm footing; he can never expect to remove the earth he rests upon, while he has no support beside for his feet, but wants, like Archimedes, some other place whereon to stand. To talk of bearing pain and grief, without any sort of present or future hope, cannot be purely greatness of spirit; there must be a mixture in it of affectation, and an alloy of pride, or perhaps is wholly counterfeit."¹⁶

F. M. DARNALL

West Texas State Teachers College

NOTES ON THE YAHOO

1. The Yahoos were not utterly vile; in fact, in one way they were better than some of the civilized people, for they had no unnatural vices.¹ Here Swift makes the Yahoo, for a moment only it is true, partake of the qualities of the Noble Savage.

By assembling the possible despicable traits the Yahoos might have had, and yet did not have, we find that they did not indulge in religious frenzies; had no organized warfare; apparently did not commit murder; had developed no philosophy or science, or Royal Society; and displayed very little servility, save in the case of the favorite of the chief, and this cringing Yahoo was despised

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, 125-6.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, IV, 175.

¹ "I expected every moment, that my master would accuse the Yahoos of those unnatural appetites in both sexes, so common among us. But nature, it seems, hath not been so expert a school-mistress; and these politer pleasures are entirely the productions of art and reason, on our side of the globe."—*Prose Works of Jonathan Swift* (ed. Temple Scott), VIII, 275.

by the rest of the tribe. Some degree of sensitiveness in the Yahoos is shown by the fact that they hated each other more than any other animal, presumably because they were so odious in appearance.² All these are purely negative virtues. For instance, the Yahoos did not seriously hurt each other in their fights because they lacked the proper weapons for murder. But the fact that they did not possess those characteristics which Swift so often mocked in man; e. g. religious zeal, makes me believe that they were not intended to represent degenerated man, for they would certainly have carried down with them some still more ignoble vestiges of former despicable characteristics. This evidence tends to confirm the belief that Swift, at times at least, thought of the Yahoo as a savage who had not come in contact with a "higher" civilization.

2. But the discussion of the Yahoos by the Houyhnhnms themselves seems to refute the conclusions just proposed. The horses had a tradition that the Yahoos had not been always in their country, "but, that many ages ago, two of these brutes appeared together upon a mountain."³ The Houyhnhnms also definitely stated that the Yahoos were not aborigines.⁴ Another tradition was that the original Yahoos had been driven to the land of the horses from across the seas. Forsaken by their companions, they degenerated and "became in process of time much more savage than those of their own species in the country whence these two originals came."⁵ In these two passages Swift himself refutes the idea proposed by some critics; namely, that the Yahoos were low-type natives, perhaps the Hottentots seen by the early explorers.⁶ And it must be admitted that he ruins the theory I proposed in an earlier passage where I doubted that the Yahoo had degenerated from a higher state. It is barely possible that Swift placed appropriate observations in the mouths of the horses, observations of a

² *Ibid.*, 271.

³ *Ibid.*, 282.

⁴ "That there seemed to be much truth in this tradition, and that those creatures could not be Ylnhniamsky (or aborigines of the land), because of the violent hatred the Houyhnhnms, as well as all other animals, bore them; which although their evil disposition sufficiently deserved, could never have arrived at so high a degree, if they had been aborigines, or else they would have long since been rooted out."—*Ibid.*, 283.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 283.

⁶ See R. W. Frantz, "Swift's Yahoos and the Voyagers," *MP.*, XXIX (1931), 49.

sort that he himself would not accept, but it is more reasonable to believe that the Houyhnhnms speak for him at all times.

3. The most vivid reaction Gulliver had to the Yahoos, and the one which lasted the longest and was most thoroughly transferred by him to his detestation of the English Yahoos, was his disgust with their stench.⁷ One wonders if part of Swift's disgust with mankind is not revealed here as being based on an almost pathological hatred of human uncleanness.

4. Not enough attention has been paid to Gulliver's final statement that he might become reconciled with "Yahoo-kind in general—if they would be content with those vices and follies only which nature hath entitled them to."⁸

I am not in the least provoked at the sight of a lawyer, a pickpocket, a colonel, a fool, a lord, a gamester, a politician, a whoremaster, a physician, an evidence, a suborner, an attorney, a traitor, or the like; this is all according to the due course of things: but when I behold a lump of deformity, and diseases both in body and mind, smitten with *pride* it immediately breaks all the measures of my patience; neither shall I be ever able to comprehend how such an animal and such a vice could tally together.⁹

This disgust with the pride of degenerate man reminds us of the famous passage in *A Discourse on the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*.

However, it is a sketch of human vanity, for every individual to imagine the whole universe is interested in his meanest concern. If he hath got cleanly over a kennel, some angel unseen hath descended on purpose to help him by the hand; if he hath knocked his head against a post, it was the devil, for his sins, let loose from hell, on purpose to buffet him. Who, that sees a little paltry mortal, droning, and dreaming, and drivelling to a multitude, can think it agreeable to common good sense, that either Heaven or Hell should be put to the trouble of influence or inspection, upon what he is about.¹⁰

This expression of disgust was more narrowly concerned with man's spiritual pride in his close relationship with Higher Powers; the passage from *Gulliver* was derisive of all his pretensions and pride.

⁷ After some time in England, Gulliver says: "Yet the smell of a Yahoo continuing very offensive, I always keep my nose well stopped with rue, lavender, or tobacco leaves."—*Prose Works of Jonathan Swift* (ed. Temple Scott), VIII, 307. See also pp. 300 and 301.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 307.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 307. The italics are Swift's.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 200.

I believe that we have in these passages the key to the mystery of why Swift scorned and ridiculed mankind. The stench of the Yahoos might be strong, but this was natural; man's despicable nature was perhaps not his fault, but his unawareness of it and his pride in what was really only Yahooism was unforgiveable.

I conclude that the Yahoos were never intended to represent any one specific type or kind of man or savage or beast. At one time they were degenerated men from a civilized land; at another time they were savages; at still another they were but the opposites of the nobler horses, who, in turn, existed only as models for ignoble but civilized mortals. Probably the truth is that Swift created no great unity in his pictures of the Yahoos, but allowed the demands of his satire of all men to dictate his treatment of our repulsive brothers and sisters. I am also of the opinion that there is a theme that links two great expressions of Swift's disgust with mankind. But perhaps the most important conclusion is that the text of Swift still demands very careful reading and interpretation.

University of Tennessee

C. M. WEBSTER

A CHECKLIST OF THE POEMS OF CHARLES SACKVILLE, SIXTH EARL OF DORSET AND MIDDLESEX

"Your lyric poems," said Dryden in a dedication to the Earl of Dorset, "are the delight and wonder of this age, and will be the envy of the next. . . . I have never attempted anything in Satyr, wherein I have not studied your writing as the most perfect model."¹ Some years later Matthew Prior wrote: "Every one of his pieces is an ingot of gold, intrinsically and solidly valuable . . . his thought was always new."² Such was the esteem in which Dorset's contemporaries professed to hold his verse,—those of them at least who had profited by his generosity or sought his patronage. At a later date Dr. Johnson, writing with more detachment, found less to admire. "Would it be imagined that, of this rival to antiquity, all his satires were little personal invectives?"³

¹ Dedication to his translation from Juvenal, *Miscellaneous Works*, London, 1760, iv, 159.

² Dedication to his *Poems on Several Occasions*, London, 1718.

³ *Lives of the Poets*, ed. by G. B. Hill, 1905, I, 307 (Dorset).

Certainly the student of seventeenth century poetry finds little to justify Dryden's praise in the scanty remains of Dorset's work that can be assembled to-day. Dorset wrote little and published less. "Your Lordship's only fault is, that you have not written more; unless I could add another, and yet a greater . . . that you have written, and out of vicious modesty will not publish."⁴ His poems appeared from time to time in miscellanies, and no attempt was made in his lifetime to collect them. One miscellany of which the second edition appeared in 1707 is entitled *The Works of the . . . Late Earls of Rochester and Roscommon, with a Collection of Originall Poems . . . by the Most Eminent Hands*. This contains poems attributed to Dorset, one of which (No. 11 in the following list) was not reprinted in a later edition which has his name on the title-page: *The Works of the Earls of Rochester, Roscomon, and Dorset . . . in Two Volumes . . .* London, 1752.⁵ In *The Works of the English Poets*⁶ (1779-1781) for which Johnson wrote the "Lives" fourteen of Dorset's poems were included. Subsequent collections, such as those of Anderson and Chalmers, are merely copies of this group.

Since no complete collection of Dorset's poems exists, and much uncertainty prevails as to what he really did write, it has seemed worth while to establish the brief canon of his productions. In the list which follows an attempt has been made to gather and arrange in chronological order the poems attributed to Dorset and to state briefly the grounds on which the attribution rests. The order is in some cases fixed by dates attached to the poems on their first appearance. In others it rests upon inference and internal evidence.

In this connection it is helpful to bear in mind a few facts of Dorset's life. He first came into prominence after the Restoration, when as Lord Buckhurst he figured in many unsavory escapades in the company of such as Sedley, Rochester, and the Merry Monarch himself. Much of the work attributed to him seems to belong to this period. His first wife, Mary Bagot, Countess of Falmouth,

⁴ Dryden, dedication to his Juvenal.

⁵ This later edition, which I consulted in the Huntington Library, is hereafter referred to as *The Works of Rochester and . . . Dorset*. A work with a similar title page but with the date 1721 was catalogued by the Library of the U. S. State Department, but the book could not be located in Washington in 1929.

⁶ The copy I have used was printed in 1800.

was of the same group and the marriage was not approved by his family. His love of satire won him the disfavor of James II when Dorset chose as its object Katharine Sedley, Countess of Dorchester, the King's mistress. About this time his wife died and he withdrew from the court. His second wife, Mary, daughter of the Earl of Northampton, was a beauty of a different stamp. Her influence was very strong, and in his retirement at Copt Hall, Essex, he seems to have steadied and changed under her companionship. Upon the accession of William of Orange he was made Lord Chamberlain, and was four times appointed among the Lords Justices with whom the government of the realm rested during that King's absences from the country. Dorset's health was broken by early excesses. It gave way after the death of his second wife, and though he returned to court occasionally, he was a semi-invalid for some years preceding his death in 1706.

1. *Pompey the Great, a Tragedy. Translated out of the French by Certain Persons of Honour.* London, 1664. The entry in the British Museum *Catalogue* supplies the information that the translators were Edmund Waller, C. Sackville, Sir C. Sedley and S. Godolphin, and the play is Pierre Corneille's *Mort de Pompée*.

In the dedication of Dryden's *Essay of Dramatick Poesy* (1668) he addresses Dorset in these words: "I am sure that my adversaries can bring no such arguments against verse, as those with which the fourth act of Pompey will furnish me in its defense." This has been construed to imply that the fourth act is the work of his patron. So Pepys (June 3, 1666): "Reading Pompey the Great (a play translated from the French by several noble persons: among others, my Lord Buckhurst) that to me is but a mean play, and the words and sense not very extraordinary."

2. *Song Written at Sea* ("To all you ladies now at land"). This is Dorset's most famous work, a ballad of eleven stanzas, supposed to have been written at sea the night before the battle of June 3, 1665, in which Buckhurst was a volunteer combatant. Johnson quotes this story, but doubts its veracity, for the reason that he was told by the Earl of Orrery, Dorset's son-in-law, that Lord Buckhurst had been a week upon it, and only finished or retouched it on the eve of the battle.⁷ Mr. Ault⁸ reprints it from

⁷ Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*, ed. Hill, 1905. I, 305.

⁸ Ault, Norman, *Seventeenth Century Lyrics*. N. Y., 1928, pp. 333, 486.

B. M. Harl. Ms. 3991, and suggests that it may have been written during the first cruise of the Duke of York against the Dutch in November, 1664. At that time the Dutch avoided an action by retiring into port, as described in the verse on "foggy Opdam". Pepys writes on January 2, 1664/65 of "a ballet I brought with me, made from the seamen at sea to their ladies in town; saying that Sir W. Pen, Sir G. Ascue, and Sir J. Lawson made them." If this is the same poem, his comment confirms the earlier date; but the assigned authorship makes the problem a bit difficult.

3. *A Song on Black Bess* ("Methinks the poor town has been troubled too long"). In the *Works of Rochester . . . and Dorset*, II, 45-46, in Johnson's list,⁹ and in *Poetical Miscellanies*, 1704, v, 285. It can be dated by internal evidence as early in 1668: "My Lord Craven's drums" mentioned therein, called soldiers to arms to subdue a mob of 'prentices (Pepys, March 24, 1667/68).

4. *To Sir Thos. St Serfe, on his Printing his Play called Tarugo's Wiles, Acted 1668* ("Tarugo gave us wonder and delight"). The *British Museum Catalogue* lists four copies of this play (1668) under the name Thomas Sydserf. The poem occurs in the *Works of Rochester . . . and Dorset*, II, 40, in Johnson's list, and in *Poetical Miscellanies*, 1704, v, 272. Genest¹⁰ reports that the play was acted in 1668 at Lincoln's Inn Fields.

5. *Song* ("Phyllis, for shame, let us improve"). In Johnson's list, but not in the *Works*. It is printed in *Westminster Drollery*, I, (1671) without attribution. Mr. Ault dates it, therefore, 1670.

6. *Epilogue, spoken by Tartuffe* ("Many have been the vain attempts of wit"). In the *Works of Rochester . . . and Dorset*, II, 41-42, and in Johnson's collection. Molière's *Tartuffe* was produced at the Theatre Royal in 1670 (Genest, I, 106-107).

7. *The Duel of the Crabs; by the Lord B—st, occasioned by Sir R. Howard His Duel of the Stags* ("In Milford-Lane, near to St. Clement's steeple"). Printed, headed as above, in *Poems on Affairs of State* (1697), I, 212; not in the *Works* or Johnson's list. The original *Duel of the Stags* was published, according to the

⁹ *The Works of the Poets of Great Britain, with Prefaces by Dr. Samuel Johnson*. London, 1800, II, 8th pagination.

¹⁰ Genest, John. *Some Account of the English Stage, 1660-1830*. Bath, 1832, I, 87.

British Museum *Catalogue*, in 1668. Buckhurst became Earl of Middlesex in 1674/75; probably the date of the parody is nearer the earlier year.

8. *To a Person of Honour (Mr. Edward Howard) on his Incomparable, Incomprehensible Poem called "The British Princes" ("Come on, ye Criticks, find one fault who dares")*. In the *Works of Rochester . . . and Dorset*, II, 38-39, in Johnson's list, and in *Poetical Miscellanies* (1704), v, 269-271. The British Museum *Catalogue* gives the date of *The Brittish Princes, an Heroick Poem*, as 1669. This poem and the next are mentioned in Mulgrave's *Essay on Satyr*, printed 1680, as follows:

Dorset . . .
Dull as Ned Howard, whom his brisker times
Have famed for dulness in malicious rhymes.

The poem also refers in uncomplimentary terms to the death of Dorset's wife, which occurred in 1679. One can only suggest a date between 1669 and 1679. The *Essay* was circulated in manuscript before printing, and may have been altered at the last moment.

9. *To the Same, on his Plays* ("Thou damn'd Antipodes to common sense"). Not in Dorset's *Works*; in Johnson's list and in Dryden's *Annual Miscellany* (1694), iv, 301.

10. *On Dolly Chamberlain, a Sempstress in the New Exchange* ("Dolly's beauty and art"). Found only in the *Works of Rochester . . . and Dorset*, II, 25. It consists of only six lines, hardly printable. For this reason I attribute it to his earlier period.

11. *On a Lady who Fancy'd Herself a Beauty* ("Dorinda's sparkling wit and eyes"). The first of the satires on Katharine Sedley, Countess of Dorchester, mistress of James II; she appeared at court about 1676/77.¹¹ It is in the *Works of Rochester . . .* (1707), II, 107-108, in Johnson's list, and in *A New Miscellany*, edited by Charles Gildon (1701). Ault reprints it from B. M. Harl. Ms. 7315.

12. *On the Countess of Dorchester . . . written 1680* ("Tell me, Dorinda, why so gay"). The name is sometimes given as Dormida. In the *Works of Rochester . . . and Dorset*, II, 24, in

¹¹ Pinto, V. de S., *Sir Charles Sedley*. London, 1927, p. 135.

Johnson's list, in *Poems on Affairs of State* (1703), II, 405, and in Dryden's *Miscellany Poems* (4th ed., 1716), II, 209.

13. *On the Same* ("Proud with the spoils of royal cully"). In the *Works* of Rochester . . . and Dorset, II, 25, in Johnson's list, and in *A New Collection of Poems Relating to Affairs of State* (1705), p. 562.

14. *Song* ("May the ambitious ever find"). Ault reprints this from B. M. Add. Ms. 19759 (circ. 1681). The tenor of the song suggests that it may have been written to his second wife before their marriage. In Johnson's collection.

15. *Epilogue on the Revival of Jonson's Play Called "Every Man in his Humour"* ("Entreaty shall not serve, nor violence"). In the *Works* of Rochester . . . and Dorset, II, 42-43, in Johnson's list, and in *Poetical Miscellanies* (1704), v, 277-280. Genest¹² gives *Every Man in his Humour* in a list of "21 old plays which were revived between 1663 and 1682." He states that it had "a good epilogue" and quotes two lines from Dorset's poem.

16. *A Faithful Catalogue of our Most Eminent Ninnies, A Satyr written in the year 1686, by the Earl of Dorset* ("Curs'd be these dull, unpointed, doggrel Rhimes"). The heading given above is taken from the *Works* of Rochester . . . and Roscommon (1707), II, 52-79. The 1752 edition and the *British Museum Catalogue* give the date as 1683. This is much longer than any of his other works. It is written in blank verse and is full of vulgar personal invective. It is mentioned in Jacob's *Poetical Register*, 1723, I, 173-175, where it is described as "a satyr upon King James' courtiers, wherein the fair Sex have also a large share of his Lordship's pointed reflections."

17. *Song* ("Corydon beneath a willow"). In Johnson's collection. This poem and the next three have nothing by which they may be dated, except that they are light satiric verse and may therefore be placed with those belonging to his earlier period.

18. *The Antiquated Coquet* ("Phyllis if you will not agree"). In Johnson's collection. A footnote reads "a satire on a lady of Ireland, supposed to be of the name of Clanbrazil." Dorset's cousin Anne, granddaughter of the first Earl of Middlesex, married in

¹² *Some Account of the English Stage*, I, 343.

1641 the Earl of Clanbrassil. She remarried after his death, in 1668, and lived twenty years longer. This gives us the identity of the lady, but does not assist much in dating the poem.

19. *A Song to Chloris*, from "The Blind Archer" ("Ah, Chloris, 'tis time to disarm your bright eyes"). In the *Works* of Rochester . . . and Dorset, II, 45, also in Johnson's group, and in *Poetical Miscellanies* (1704), v, 284.

20. *Song* ("Phyllis, the fairest of love's foes"). In Johnson's list, and appeared in *Poetical Miscellanies* (1704), v, 287, without attribution.

21. *Knotting* ("At noon, on a sunshiny day"). In the *Works* of Rochester . . . and Dorset, II, 44-45. A footnote says it was written in compliment to Queen Mary. The date is therefore 1689 or later. It is also mentioned in Jacob's *Poetical Register*, is included in Johnson's list, and in *Poetical Miscellanies*, v, 281-283.

22. *The Fire of Love* ("The fire of love in youthful blood"). Ault attributes this to Dorset. It was printed without attribution in Shadwell's *Amorous Bigot* (1690), and in *Examen Miscellaneum* (1702), p. 6, where it is "said to be by Earl D." Its subject and general style offer no obstacle to this belief.

23. *The Indulgent Whore; or, Madame Maintenon's Advice to the French King*. Written by the Earl of Dorset, in 1697 ("In grey-hair'd Celia's wither'd arms"). This poem is thus entered in the *Works* of Rochester . . . and Dorset, II, 103. In Dryden's *Examen Poeticum*, being the third part of *Miscellany Poems* (1693), 418-421, it is printed opposite a French poem of which it is a paraphrase, beginning "La jeune Iris aux cheveux gris."

24. *Song* ("Sylvia, methinks you are unfit"). In Johnson's collection, and also in *A New Miscellany of Original Poems*, edited by Charles Gildon (1701), pp. 94-95.

25. *Poem, by a Person of Honour* ("Though, Phyllis, your pre-vailing charms"). An anonymous poem in *A Collection of Poems*, viz., *The Temple of Death*, by the Marquis of Normanby (1701), p. 106. It is similar to Dorset's other work, and is immediately followed by Dorset's *Epilogue to Every Man in his Humour*, "by the same author." The same poem, without attribution, is found in *Poetical Miscellanies*, v, 294.

26. Another work which may contain something from Dorset's hand is listed under his name in Arber's *Term Catalogues*, II, 542.

The New Academy of Complements; erected for Ladies, Gentlewomen, Courtiers, Gentlemen . . . compiled by L. B. [i. e. Charles Sackville, Lord Buckhurst] Sir C[harles] S[edley], Sir W[illiam] D[avenant], and others, The most refined Wits of this Age. London, 1681. The names in brackets are supplied by Arber. All poems, letters, etc., are anonymously printed, and the lyrics include several of Shakespeare's.

HELEN A. BAGLEY

Philadelphia

RÉPONSE A M. BAUDIN

Je ne puis passer sous silence le compte rendu de mon livre, *Conventions du Théâtre Bourgeois Contemporain en France, 1887-1914*, par M. Maurice Baudin, dans votre numéro de mars. Je veux bien admettre la justesse de sa critique sur l'omission, dans ma bibliographie, de l'ouvrage de S. M. Waxman. Il est vrai qu'une bonne partie du contenu de cet ouvrage, pour ce qui touche le sujet de mon étude, se trouve dans d'autres livres et articles cités par moi; néanmoins j'avais voulu mentionner Waxman, et la circonstance que son ouvrage n'était pas publié lorsque j'ai envoyé mon manuscrit au premier éditeur avec qui je suis entré en pourparlers, peut expliquer mon inadvertance sans la justifier. Mais le plus grand péché que j'ai commis (péché qui suffit à expliquer la critique partielle et sarcastique de M. Baudin), c'est de ne pas avoir mentionné trois articles par M. Baudin lui-même, qui, eux aussi, ont paru après l'achèvement de mon manuscrit. Je ne les mentionnerai pas maintenant, car M. Baudin l'a déjà fait, en expliquant que ma "discrète approbation" l'oblige à sortir de sa modestie d'auteur. M. Baudin voudrait-il laisser entendre par cette expression que j'ai fait des emprunts à ses articles sans en rendre témoignage? Si c'est le cas, il a tort; je ne lui ai rien emprunté.

M. Baudin ne critique pas sérieusement quelques-unes des parties les plus importantes de mon livre; il les effleure à peine. Ailleurs, il ne fait que chicaner sur les mots. Par exemple, il dit que j'ai commis un non-sens en écrivant, à propos du personnage décoré, qu'il est présenté sous l'un ou l'autre de deux aspects: "ou bien il veut une décoration à tout prix, ou bien la chose est traitée de façon frivole et satirique." D'après M. Baudin, cela revient à dire que, "sous l'un comme sous l'autre aspect," le personnage décoré n'a

pas de décoration. Ai-je besoin de faire observer que cette conclusion, même par l'interprétation la plus littérale, ne se justifie nullement sous le second aspect, et qu'en tout cas, le personnage qui veut une décoration au commencement de la pièce peut fort bien l'avoir à la fin, que l'on peut penser à soi comme à un personnage décoré *in posse*, etc.? M. Baudin renvoie aussi au passage où j'ai fait un classement des pièces selon le motif de l'amour. Dans ma première catégorie, j'avais compris celles où un adultère, passé, actuel, ou imminent, joue un rôle important, et M. Baudin s'en prend à moi pour y avoir mis *Révoltée*, de Lemaître; il dit qu'avant moi, personne n'avait soupçonné un adultère dans cette pièce. Cependant, cet adultère et ses conséquences sont discutés assez longuement dans Acte II, Scène VII; si Hélène avait été une fille légitime, elle n'aurait pas été la "révoltée" qu'elle est devenue; et la scène où elle reconnaît sa mère est une des plus importantes de la pièce. Mais parce que l'acte même de l'adultère a eu lieu avant le commencement de la pièce, M. Baudin prétend qu'aucun critique n'en a soupçonné l'existence! Dans *Mariage blanc*, où il m'accuse d'avoir inventé un adultère imminent, comment peut-on douter de la réalité de cette imminence, vu le caractère de Marthe? Que Simone ne sache pas en quoi consiste un adultère, peu importe; la crise qui la tue est quand même provoquée par la vue de son mari étreignant Marthe. Et si Grâce de Plessans, dans *La Marche nuptiale*, ne s'est tuée que pour ne pas survivre à son roman d'amour, pourquoi pas à la fin du troisième acte? Son roman d'amour était bien fini avec sa découverte du vol commis par Claude. Elle se suicide seulement après s'être rendu compte qu'elle va céder aux instances de Lechâtelier.

Reste l'accusation la plus sérieuse de toutes. M. Baudin dit que mon français est "surchargé d'incorrections" et qu'il contient des phrases "de pur charabia." Il n'en cite aucun exemple, et je trouve curieux que ces graves défauts soient passés inaperçus des professeurs français qui ont lu mon manuscrit, surtout d'un professeur agrégé qui l'a examiné expressément pour y relever les fautes qui pourraient s'y trouver. En tout cas, j'accepterais de meilleure grâce les remarques de M. Baudin si ce n'était pas le cas de la pelle qui se moque du fourgon. Et je ferai pour lui ce qu'il n'a pas fait pour moi: je citerai. Dans son compte rendu, il emploie l'expression tautologique "rouvrir à nouveau." Dans ses trois articles dont il parle, je trouve les termes "intervallaires" et "traditionniste," que le Grand Larousse ignore; des mots désuets comme "dramatiste"; des incorrections comme "à de rares exceptions" (deux fois); un anglicisme, "non seulement nous dit-il"; des sujets

pluriels avec verbe au singulier, comme "Les entretiens de Mme Roucher avec M. Didier-Morel passe bientôt les bornes de la politique," et "Si ces géants se portent des coups si terribles, ce n'est pas que leur malice soit profonde, c'est qu'il ignore l'art de se garder"; une phrase sans tête (ou est-ce un abus de la préposition *dans*?) : "Dans *Paris New-York*, écrit en collaboration avec M. Paul Arène, 1907, ramena l'Américaine au Vaudeville." Et je défie M. Baudin de trouver dans mon livre un exemple d'incorrection ou de charabia égal aux deux suivants, tirés de ses articles, et dans lesquels son emploi de la conjonction *que*, non seulement superflu mais inadmissible par toutes les règles de la syntaxe, donne à la phrase une allure ridicule. "Tout s'arrangera, car Smith est patient et bon; et qu'il tient par-dessus tout à ce que l'Amérique et la France s'entendent." Et "Les enseignements du docteur Deborah portent bientôt leurs fruits, car le champ est fertile, et que l'éducation américaine ne perd rien à être transplantée." Je ne dirai rien de nombreuses autres fautes, parce qu'elles peuvent être des fautes d'impression. Mais à tout prendre, il me semble que M. Baudin a encore un stage à faire avant de s'ériger en défenseur si chatouilleux de la langue et du style.

CLIFFORD H. BISSELL

University of California

RÉPONSE A M. BISSELL

En ce qui concerne les adultères *imminents* il est évidemment inutile de contrarier Mr. Bissell. Il a le flair. Cependant s'il compare ce que j'ai dit à propos de *Révoltée* avec ce qu'il me fait dire il verra tout de suite que ce n'est plus la même chose. Pour ce qui regarde *la Marche nuptiale*, j'ai tenté d'indiquer que Mr. B. diminuait le personnage de l'héroïne. J'ai cité d'autres cas où Mr. B. simplifie un peu trop. Il n'analyse pas. Il rapetisse. Quant à cette *chose* d'homme décoré qui *veut* une décoration et *peut fort bien l'avoir à la fin*, me suis-je trompé en disant que "décoré" signifie "n'ayant pas de décoration" ?

Si je n'ai pas insisté davantage sur "les parties les plus importantes" du travail de Mr. B., c'est que pour en mesurer l'apport il eût fallu, encore une fois, en compléter la bibliographie. J'ai mentionné mes articles de détail à côté de l'ouvrage d'ensemble de Mr. Waxman pour marquer le rigoureux procédé d'élimination d'où est sortie la bibliographie de Mr. B. Mais Mr. B. soulève une question

de dates que je n'avais pas prévue. J'eusse apparemment mieux fait de proposer d'autres exemples d'omission, disons l'article de Pellissier, *la Convention au Théâtre*, 1886, *R. A. D.*, III, pp. 12-27, et l'ouvrage de Mr. E. Dawson, *Henri Becque, Sa Vie et Son Théâtre*, 1923, mais pouvais-je soupçonner que le livre de Mr. B. eût été cinq années en un inaltérable cours de publication?

J'ai dit que Mr. B. ne lit pas assez ni assez soigneusement. Prenons un exemple: "Sarcey dit que le Théâtre Libre avait "pour esthétique de découper sur le théâtre des tranches de la vie réelle" (*Quarante Ans de Théâtre*, vol. 8, p. 330) (vii). Le passage attribué à S. n'est pas à l'endroit indiqué, mais, à la page 245 du même volume, Sarcey lui-même dit que la formule en question n'est pas de lui. Après cela peut-on se fier à Mr. B. qui déclare Sarcey adversaire d'Antoine et du Théâtre Libre (6, 133)? Voilà qui diminuerait singulièrement le rôle de S. dans l'histoire du Th. L. J'aime mieux m'en remettre là-dessus au jugement de Mr. Waxman.

Pour mes fautes à moi, la liste ci-dessus n'est pas suffisante, hélas! puisqu'elle contient des échantillons qui ne sont pas des fautes, et que de tous mes pléonasmes on a choisi celui que je pourrais le moins malaisément justifier: le chapitre de conclusions de Mr. B. rouvre une fois de plus des discussions déjà ressassées un peu partout. Mais quand le récit de mes fautes serait plus formidable encore, certains passages de l'ouvrage dont il s'agit ici n'en paraîtraient pas moins impénétrables ou bouffons. J'ai eu tôt sans doute de critiquer le langage de Mr. B., mais comment pouvais-je savoir qu'un professeur agrégé eût examiné son manuscrit *expressément pour y relever les fautes qui pourraient s'y trouver*, et que celles que j'ai trouvées dans le livre ne sauraient y être. J'ai déjà donné deux exemples provenant d'un même paragraphe (vii-viii); je peux bien continuer:

Les classiques, du moins Racine, n'aimaient pas. . . (33)

Qui voudrait rayer, ou changer en dialogue, le fameux monologue de don Diègue . . . ? Toute la scène y perdrait. (33-34)

. . . l'homme qui fait une profession de l'amour, mais sans souffrir de l'opprobre qui accompagne la prostituée. (102)

. . . les Français . . . sont beaucoup plus sensibles que nous aux suggestions sexuelles intérieures. (161)

On trouvera des passages de même force aux pages 10, 21, 109, 145.

Il y a des fautes de mots, d'expressions ou de constructions aux pages ix, x, 2 (2), 4, 6, 9, 10 (2), 11, 20, 40 (2), 43, 44, 46, 56, 80, 99, 101, 160.¹ Il y a des contradictions aux pages 85 et 131

¹ Je ne parle pas de l'expression: "C'est tout qu'elle" (140), ni de

(§§ sur *le Marché*), 76 et 102 (*le Passé*). Je remets le catalogue de ces fautes à l'éditeur de *MLN*.

On peut se demander même si le titre de *Théâtre . . . Contemporain* convient à une étude qui n'embrasse pas les seize dernières années de la production dramatique. Il faudrait considérer, bien entendu, la question de la date de l'achèvement du manuscrit.

MAURICE BAUDIN

New York University

CONCLUSION

En réponse à M. Baudin: je sais fort bien que l'expression "tranche de (la) vie" est de Jullien, mais la phrase qui la contient, et que j'ai citée, est de Sarcey, vol. 8, p. 300 ("330" est une malheureuse coquille); c'est à Sarcey donc qu'il fallait l'attribuer.

Pour la pièce *Révoltée*, j'avais dit qu'il s'y trouvait un adultère (qui pouvait être actuel, passé, ou imminent, et qui était, dans ce cas-ci, passé); M. Baudin a dit qu'il n'y en avait point. Voilà tout.

Nous ne paraissions pas avoir les mêmes idées sur ce qui constitue une faute de français. J'aime autant m'en remettre au jugement de mon critique ici, qui est non seulement agrégé mais docteur ès lettres. En particulier, je ne vois pas où je me serais contredit dans les passages sur *Le Marché* et *Le Passé* auxquels renvoie M. Baudin. Les "tout qu'elle" et "seraient" sont déjà corrigés par un feuillet "Errata" dans les exemplaires de mon livre en vente à Paris.

Quant au mot "contemporain" dans mon titre, il ne peut tromper personne, puisque les dates 1887-1914 font partie dudit titre.

CLIFFORD H. BISSELL

l'emploi de *seraient* pour *serait* (150); je ne ferai ni à Mr. Bissell ni à moi-même l'injure de croire que ce soit autre chose que des coquilles. Je m'empresse d'ajouter que le livre de Mr. B. contient très peu de coquilles.

REVIEWS

English Biography in the Eighteenth Century. By MARK LONGAKER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931. Pp. ix + 519. \$5.00.

Abraham Cowley, the Muse's Hannibal. By ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT. New York: Oxford University Press, 1931. Pp. vii + 367; 10 illustrations. \$4.75.

Readings in Biography. By CLARA L. MYERS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931. Pp. x + 383. \$1.75.

The growth of biography in the last 150 years is one of the most striking phenomena in English letters. The publishing of lives seems, even at the present time, increasing; biographical methods have invaded and changed even the contemporary drama and novel. Criticism has not yet begun to catch up with this important branch of literature. The few writers who have thus far treated biography seriously and critically have encountered the type of obstacles met by all pioneers. Their findings have been inadequate. But they have established, at least, the groundwork for detailed study, and have shown the necessity of determining standards applicable to this distinctive and vital literary form.

Dr. Longaker's study is of particular interest, therefore, because it concentrates on a single epoch and selects for study a century which is of great importance in the development of life-writing. This narrowing of the field to the eighteenth century, coupled with the length of the book, makes it possible for him to devote extended separate chapters to Roger North's account of his three brothers, to Mason's *Memoirs of Gray*, to Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, and, of course, to Boswell. These figures are set in their places by general chapters which trace life-writing before the eighteenth century, the fertilizing influences which made later diversity possible, the growth of realism, the advance of scholarly methods, the work of the lexicographers, and the relations of peripheral forms to pure biography. Autobiography is not discussed.

The difficulties of such an approach are obvious. The use of parallel categories makes it difficult to observe the development of eighteenth-century biography in its entirety. After reaching the year 1801 at the end of Chapter V on scholarly methods, the reader is carried back to 1548 at the start of the next chapter on lexicography. A chronological table of significant publications might have disposed of this objection, but Dr. Longaker has preferred separate bibliographies following each of his ten chapters. This renders each division complete and convenient in itself but tends to make the book a collection of disparate essays.

A further problem in dividing biographies by *genres* is that of the classification itself. Dr. Longaker's divisions, though arbitrary, prove workable, and repetition of material has usually been held under control. Several passages might well have been collapsed or omitted (such as pp. 240-248, which merely restates pp. 48-56, often even with the same footnotes and illustrations). Some critical dicta and striking catch-phrases are frequently repeated; for example, Steele's, "There is a satisfaction to curiosity in knowing the adventures of the meanest of mankind," is quoted in full or in part no less than six times in one chapter, and twice more in another.

The preface states that "It is to provide additional information and to establish more firmly critical standards for the appreciation of biography that this study is presented." The additional information is present on every page and will be welcomed by all lovers of biography. The critical standards, however, are more elusive, for the general manner of treatment is descriptive rather than analytical, and there are few summaries. Dr. Longaker's principal requirement for true biography seems to be accuracy. In his dwelling almost exclusively upon proofs, authenticity, reliability, acknowledgement of debts, he tends to identify the Hanoverian biographer with the modern scholar, and to rule him out as a creative artist. Eight pages, for example (303-10), are devoted to demonstrating that Mason did not publish word-for-word copies of Gray's letters. Mason, however, was an eighteenth-century biographer and not a twentieth-century scholarly editor. Danger lurks in subjecting each separate biography to the bed of Procrustes, because (except possibly for antiquarian lexicography) each biography is governed by the individual and unique relations existing between the chronicler and the chronicled. There are, therefore, fewer fixed rules for writing a good biography than for writing a good novel. Interpretation, evaluation, style, organization—such important attributes of the good biographer are relatively neglected in this study in favor of the lengthy analysis of sources and the testing of facts. To this extent the author is conceding that biography is a branch of history rather than of literature. He deals with the lives of highwaymen, pirates, beggars and strumpets under the heading, "The Growth of Realism". A case might easily be made out to show that the treatment of action and setting in the rogue biographies and the "Lives and Amours" publications is far more lurid, sentimental, and divorced from actuality than in the seventeenth-century biographies which preceded them.

Dr. Longaker's observations on the *Lives of the Norths* form a delightful interlude; his chapter on William Mason is instructive, but it is his treatment of Johnson and of Boswell that deserves closest attention. In the latter's case particularly, owing to the newly available Boswell material and the concentration on Boswell

the *biographer*, Dr. Longaker has made a contribution. Many of his statements are stimulating and just; and for his organized and sustained treatment of Boswell's achievements, Dr. Longaker deserves praise. His book as a whole cannot be overlooked by any serious student of biography.

The manner of Professor Nethercot's *Abraham Cowley* is engaging, and the matter contains certain facts in the poet's life never before presented. The growing cult of John Donne and his school has created a need for a study of the poet whom Johnson considered Donne's principal follower. Professor Nethercot's biography of Cowley, therefore, comes most carefully upon the hour. It is not, however, an occasional book, but gives evidence throughout of long study and matured reflection. The focus has been upon the courtier and Royalist rather than the poet, which permits filling in the necessary historical background and sketching Cowley's many distinguished friends and patrons in the lifelike miniatures—Saint Albans, the Duke of Buckingham, Henrietta Maria—that form such an agreeable feature of the book. The author has succeeded to an unusual degree in making his account at once authoritative and readable. His materials, and the measured judgments he draws from them, inspire confidence; the style is pleasant, and affords stiff going in rare instances only, where new documents must be explained in detail (as in the involved tenth chapter, "Spy and Apostate", and the opening of "The Sabine Farm", in which the dust of archives obscures the green trees of Saint Anne's Hill).

In the middle period of his life, Cowley disappears in the chaos of civil wars, as did so many of his friends. It must be confessed that the new discoveries which Professor Nethercot offers concerning Cowley's activities as a Royalist spy, and later his desertion to Cromwell's government, do not present the poet in a favorable light. But the religious and civil conflicts of the seventeenth century have played havoc with the characters of other literary figures—with almost all those temporizers, in fact, who were able to regard events with neither the jocularity of Thomas Fuller nor the conviction of Milton. As a responsible biographer, Professor Nethercot presents Cowley's case as fairly as possible. He may underestimate the poet's double-dealing. Although, in default of further evidence, Cowley's treachery must rest as "not proven", nevertheless his continued disfavor after the Restoration, so contrary to Charles's usual policy of clemency, points toward a more serious breach of trust than Professor Nethercot is willing to suggest. Of course, as the author argues ably, Charles would never feel great love for a man who could, under Cromwell, write an ode in praise of Brutus. The implications were too obvious.

Certain recurrent themes give the book unity and direction. Among these might be mentioned Cowley's indecision, his love—at least on paper—for idyllic landscape, his interest in natural philosophy, his latent epicureanism, the influence upon his thought

of Bacon, Hobbes, and the empiricists, and his persistent bad luck offset by never-failing and powerful friends. The grand passion seems never to have dominated the poet. Although in a general sense Cowley may have been "Love's Columbus", Professor Nethercot is unable to identify specifically the Indies he discovers. Heleonora, then, must remain simply Cowley's *Mistress*, a poem rather than a person.

Critical judgment on Cowley as "The Last of the Metaphysical Race" is reserved for a final chapter. Professor Nethercot is chary in his use of the term "metaphysical", partly because he considers unfortunate its vague use to describe at once peculiarities of thought and style, partly because he believes it carries opprobrious connotations. In Dryden's sense—that is, the application of intellect in interpreting emotion—it seems just for much of Cowley's work. But Professor Nethercot suggests that this is not the important Cowley, that he was really a writer of two styles, and that the involved and ingenious youthful poetry so admired by his contemporaries is of less interest to-day than his classical translations and imitations and his supple, personal prose.

In her *Readings in Biography*, Miss Myers has edited standard works, or selections from them. Beginning with Carlyle's essay on biography, and one continental example each from the classical, medieval and Renaissance periods, she turns to English lives and confines herself to them from Cavendish to James Truslow Adams. The selections are suitable for elementary classes, and are supplemented by lists of questions and a bibliography for further readings.

DONALD A. STAUFFER

Princeton University

A Survey of Burlesque and Parody in English. By GEORGE KITCHIN. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1931. xxiii + 387 pp. 16 s.

This book is obviously the work of an enthusiastic scholar; it embodies the reading of many years, and throws light on not a few out-of-the-way chapters in English literature. Surveying a vast field from a particular angle, it cuts across a number of traditional sections, and invites useful testing of accepted values. At the same time, serious doubt must be expressed as to the complete success of the undertaking. The very subject raises objections. What is exactly the relation implied between burlesque and parody? The author dismisses the problem rather easily (Introduction, xx-xxii), explaining that on the strength of English usage he will regard the two words as practically synonymous. The single shade of difference he keeps up is that "parody" answers to "direct imitation of an individual work with humorous or

critical intentions," while "burlesque" is "the wider species in which an author's work generally or that of the school to which he may be attached is imitated with comic intentions" (p. xxii). Exception might be taken to all that, but the discussion would be too long. On those very terms, what purpose can be served by a full history of burlesque and parody—or rather parody and burlesque, parody being the major notion and more frequent word by far in the present book? The author's aim, he says, is to throw light upon the development of letters, as governed by the critical reactions of taste (p. ix-x). Parody reveals the dissatisfaction with some aspect of the prevailing standard, and thus heralds the correction or the change. This is a somewhat over-simplified view. It does not seem tenable to assert that parody is "an unrivalled index to contemporary taste" (p. x). Taste is here a collective thing, while parody may be a thoroughly individual affair. In modern times especially, it is no check to all excesses, actuated by the fairness of "central-minded persons" (p. x), but a manner of self-expression, sought for its own sake by minds gifted with a certain imitative talent. The question of success, and prevalent public approval, of course, would raise a more valid issue; but Dr. Kitchin does not base his argument upon that. In fact, one can and does parody anything. Parody not only may, but it will be unfair. Again, it is not always critical; it can just as well be sympathetic and friendly, and so, even less significant as a symptom of insurgent taste. There appears thus to be little substance for a systematic disquisition in that inferior literary "genre"—a merely negative one, a sort of virtual or actual shadow to all positive types; if consistently worked, parody might provide the necessary corrective to all modes, and link up with direct criticism; but there is no appearance that it ever was or is at all coherently worked; and criticism, in which there lives at least a conscious attempt at responsibility and system, is the real thing; there we should look for the negative forces which round off the developing artistic mind of a nation.—But criticism grew late, and Dr. Kitchin is on firmer ground when he makes capital out of the fact. There was a time indeed when parody more or less supplied the deficiency of criticism. Those were the centuries in which literary fashions were really binding, and connected with political and religious systems; so that there was a good deal of repression involved in an obedience which concerned the whole human being, and could do violence to its instincts. Thus it was that the burlesque of Church discipline, of chivalry codes or "amour courtois" had the character of a psychological rebellion. But it is hardly so any more; parody at the present time is a gratuitously chosen task, implying only the possession of a special cleverness. What can one build upon that? Roughly speaking, the classical age would be in that respect the parting era between early and modern parody. The author's view of the process, which he partly

recognizes, is that early parody was generally hostile to "things as they are," while modern parodists are almost always "watch dogs" of the established order—of social, political, artistic orthodoxy; the cause being, that only from the Renaissance were the professions "soundly established" (p. xiii), and members of the literary craft could grow aware of their corporate interests. I should put it otherwise: with the rise to power of the middle classes, the writers, who mostly belonged to them, felt increasingly like them in their social tone of stiffening conservatism. At the same time, opinion grew free to a very large extent; and parodists, ceasing to vent actual repressions, lost most of their sting. Lastly, the natural affinity between a derisive mood, a talent for destructive imitation, and the intellectual, fastidious taste of the highly cultivated, made itself felt more and more; it is easy to ridicule reforming zeal in the name of cool sense, less easy to ridicule sluggish wisdom in the name of zeal. The same change that made parody less violent emptied it of its life-blood; political animus, in revolutionary years, could still vitalize the "Anti-Jacobin" group; but the nineteenth century, which Dr. Kitchin regards as the age of crowning achievements in that field, seems rather a time of sophisticated, futile, brilliant displays. Calverley, "one of the great masters of parody" (p. 298), leaves us singularly cold. Indeed the soul of parody is no other than the spirit of satire. . . .

In conclusion, a full consecutive history of parody does not seem to be a repaying expenditure of energy. Whenever the story is on solid ground, and gathers substance, it crosses some other plane than its own, coincides with a survey of satire, or criticism, or public taste in its interaction with psychological and social influences, or comedy, or humour, or the mock-heroic—actual notions these, with a body and an evolution of their own. Or again, histories of burlesque should be written, but not of parody; even burlesque should not be regarded as one kind, and studied all through, but confined to periods during which it was prompted by a relatively permanent set of impulses. This brings me to a last point: Dr. Kitchin, illogically enough, has his own standards of "good" and "bad" parody, and they are coloured by the natural preferences of a scholar of academic breeding with a strong feeling of allegiance to the classics. The consequence is, first, that too much stress is laid on parody as "the college man's wittily expressed dislike of the art that either in sentiment or technique departs too markedly from the cultured tradition of the tribe" (p. 298). One might point out that in the name of those ideals the highest initiatives of genius and the deepest chords of artistic emotion are sure to be ridiculed; a reaction that has annoyed many a sensitive poet and often delayed inevitable change, but does not much matter, after all—far from being a motive power—in the story of creative literature. A more serious result is that there

follows some arbitrariness in Dr. Kitchin's valuation of historical movements. If not the greatest age of parody, at least that in which its spirit was most widely diffused was the neo-classic period, from the Restoration to the middle of the eighteenth century. Then it was that most writers—and the very eminent as well as the common run—wrote more or less with an imitative-derisive intent; and the origin of the impulse is plain enough: the age as a whole suffered under an intellectual repression; while paying lip-service to the ancients, the "rules" and all the tenets of classical orthodoxy, it was secretly ill at ease in its professed faith, and found subconscious vents for the need of sincerity in the various modes, degrees and shades of the mock-heroic: dignified themes of the traditional kind, treated in a clearly or subacidly burlesque manner. But this clashes with Dr. Kitchin's favourite thesis that parody is "classically minded," and always more or less aimed at the pranks of romance; and so he undervalues, as unworthy of his detailed notice, that very important aspect of a whole century of English letters. A recent book with which he does not seem to be acquainted: Mr. A. H. West's *L'influence française dans la poésie burlesque en Angleterre entre 1660 et 1700* (Paris, 1930), does hardly more than touch the fringe of the subject.—It would be superfluous after that to point out minor inaccuracies and slips, such as the perverse "Mr. James Cabell Branch" of p. xvi; and the last word should be one of homage—an homage not ironical but sincere and warm—to the author's industry, admirable even if perhaps not altogether well advised.

L. CAZAMIAN

Université de Paris

Dante Gabriel Rossetti. An Analytical List of Manuscripts in the Duke University Library, with hitherto Unpublished Verse and Prose. Edited by PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM. Durham: Duke University Press, 1931. Pp. x + 122. \$2.00.

Mr. Baum gives us in very attractive form a body of Rossetti manuscripts comprising a number of sonnets hitherto not published, versions of work already published, and notes important in showing Rossetti's method of work. The division of the work into parts, an analytical list and the manuscripts themselves, makes as usable an arrangement as could be imagined, and Mr. Baum's definition of the relation of these versions to the printed poems, where extended analysis was necessary, is acute and clear. It is not within the scope of the volume to gather together all the variants of the poems—to see this we now need to have a number of volumes before us—but since Mr. Baum compares his versions with those printed by Rossetti, it is a pity that he did not indicate the relation of his version to the earliest printed version as well as to the

standard one. Thus in collating the manuscript of "On an Allegorical Dance of Women" with the print, he might well have noted that the manuscript differs in only two small details (10. and 14.) from the version printed by Rossetti in "The Germ."

These manuscripts open up an interesting tract to those who would follow Rossetti on his Road to Xanadu. The material confirms the impression of other variants in two important regards. We see again Rossetti's painstaking care for rich detail. And we see the gradual evolution of his thought. Sonnets or fragments which begin as mere explicit descriptions of particular situations evolve into generalized interpretations. In so doing they become more intensely autobiographical on the psychological side though less so externally. Item 36 on page 63 and the notes for "Soothsay" on page 77, with Mr. Baum's comment, well illustrate this second point. One fascinating gleam may be noted. In item 48 of Rossetti's notes for "God's Graal", which he was working on up to March 1870, Rossetti has culled out from Sir Ector's vision one detail which closely parallels a key detail of the complex Willow-wood sonnets. The concepts jotted down either in prose or in a line or two of verse which afterwards got pulled into whole poems after Pope's fashion form an interesting part of the material.

The two most important items are the prose cartoon and verse version of "Rosemary", and the poem "On Mary's Portrait", later largely reworked into "The Portrait". The former is illuminating for a study of Rossetti's aesthetic. The latter is a very fascinating poem. We have so little of Rossetti's early work with its magic of a poignant and fresh vision that later faded. "The Portrait" is far profounder in its expression of personal passion, and its technique is more assured, but the flashing vision of the other world breaking in upon this has fled: and to accompany this vision in the earlier poem there is a magic of thin high notes in the verse. In its general thought, "On Mary's Portrait" shows again how early certain concepts and surmises about life took shape in Rossetti's mind and how they persisted, to shape his experience.

There are three facsimile illustrations, two showing the condition of the manuscript, the third a drawing which everyone will be glad to have.

RUTH C. WALLERSTEIN

University of Wisconsin

Spenser's "*The Shepherd's Calendar*." Edited by W. L. RENWICK. London: Scholartis Press, 1930. Pp. viii + 242.

Professor Renwick's edition of *The Shepherd's Calendar* is his third and last volume of Spenser's minor poetry. Like its predecessors, it reveals his broad view of classical and Renaissance literatures, and his ability to see Spenser's work in relation to the

complex literary influences of the poet's time. Sources are treated in a most satisfactory manner, with succinct comment, but with such copious quotations that the reader can see for himself just how Spenser has used Virgil, Petrarch, Mantuan, Marot, and the rest.

Dr. Herford, in his edition of *The Calendar*, reprints E. K.'s Gloss along with his own notes. Dr. Renwick, however, prints the Gloss as Spenser did, and then annotates it as he does Spenser's text. This annotation of the Gloss has entailed no little labor, for E. K.'s ideas are often mistaken and his references vague; and Dr. Renwick frankly admits his inability to unravel some statements. He confirms the conclusion of Dr. Herford, Dr. Higginson, and others, that E. K. cannot be a screen for Spenser himself; he says: "after working through the poems and the glosses one feels the contact of a different, a less flexible mind."

No part of the *Calendar* has proved more interesting to the critics than the ecclesiastical eclogues, and indeed these may well have seemed to Spenser the most significant portion of his little book. His interest in ecclesiastical affairs, most likely aroused at Cambridge, could hardly fail to be intensified after he had become secretary to a bishop. The Bishop of Rochester, he tells us in "September," was an exemplary pastor. The example of so good a man must have made the conduct of many of the slothful and self-seeking churchmen countenanced by Elizabeth's ecclesiastical system seem doubly bad. In three eclogues Spenser reiterates the ultra-Protestant view of unworthy pastors, and in his epilogue expresses the hope that his book will teach "the ruder shepherd" how to feed and guard his sheep. So outspoken is he that we cannot wonder at his and E. K.'s fear of "envious" attacks. The fact that he is on dangerous ground causes intentional ambiguity and partial concealment that make interpretation sometimes difficult.

Dr. Renwick provides a rational elucidation of these eclogues ("May," "July," and "September"). While he recognizes that most of Spenser's shafts are directed against incompetent, selfish Anglicans, he sees, as others have, a reference to Roman activity in the latter part of "September" (ll. 148 ff.). He also sees in the fable of "May" an attack on "the secret adherents of Rome"; and in lines 80-101 of "September" he considers Rome the target, though he admits that both passages may be read as satire on the High Church party. His conclusions in regard to these passages coincide with the explanations of E. K. Throughout his commentary, Dr. Renwick reveals considerable faith in the veracity of E. K., who, he insists, though sometimes lacking in candor, rarely indulges in downright lying.

"February" is sometimes interpreted as a fourth ecclesiastical eclogue, but Dr. Renwick takes the theme to be merely "the reverence due to age and station." He twice refers to Dr. Higginson's interpretation, but makes no reference to what seems to me the

more convincing argument of Dr. Greenlaw (*PMLA.*, xxvi, 428-32), who finds in the Brier a symbol of "the proud Anglican church." Dr. Renwick refers to the assertion of E. K. that this eclogue has no "secrete or particular purpose," and declares that we are not "entitled to suspect him without much more reason than we have here." Though I for one regret Dr. Renwick's failure to disregard E. K.'s assertion and probe "February" more deeply, I cannot regret his habit in this volume and elsewhere of resolutely subordinating his discussions of highly doubtful conjectures to the treatment of Spenser's ideas and artistic aims.

A. C. JUDSON

Indiana University

Thomas Lodge, *The History of an Elizabethan*. By N. BURTON PARADISE. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931. Pp. ix + 254. \$3.00.

In his *Seventeenth Century Studies*, Edmund Gosse allows himself to fancy the recovery of a biography, full and complete, of Thomas Lodge. Such a biography, he writes,

would combine, in a series of pictures, scenes from all the principal conditions of life in that stirring and vigorous age. It would introduce us to the stately civic life of London city, to Oxford in the early glow of humanism and liberal thought, to the dawn of professional literature in London, to the . . . adventures of a freebooting sailor on the high seas, to the poetry of the age, and then to its science, to the . . . humdrum existence of a country practitioner, and to the perilous intrigues of a sympathizer with Catholicism trembling on the verge of treason.

Professor Paradise calls his book *The History of an Elizabethan*. It was begun, however, as a doctoral dissertation, and with that in mind one should perhaps forget the ideal of such a biography as Gosse describes.

The History of an Elizabethan is composed of three chapters on Lodge's life; three chapters on Lodge's writings (his non-dramatic and dramatic works to 1597, and the translations of his last years); three appendices, "Abstracts of Wills," an enumeration of Lodge's borrowings, and a chronological list of his works; and, finally, an index. The biographical chapters add considerably to our knowledge of the facts of Lodge's life. Thus, Mr. Paradise has turned up documents which bear on the poet's financial troubles. The voyage on which Lodge wrote *Rosalynde* is dated with some finality "in the spring of 1585"; and his supposed will of 1583 is shown to be that of another person. Mr. Paradise has also an interesting suggestion to make with regard to the important autobiographical passage in Lodge's verses prefixed to Riche's *Don Simonides*. These verses, he maintains, will not bear the interpretation usually given them: "there is more evidence that Lodge suffered" persecution

because of his religion "than that he lived in sponging houses and was hunted from society because of dire poverty and loose conduct" (p. 22). It may be added that Mr. Paradise's findings are presented with an engaging modesty.

His critical chapters leave more to be desired. The diversity of Lodge's literary ventures was, of course, extraordinary, and the historical critic must define the characteristics of all the kinds in which Lodge worked and show how he adheres to, or departs from, their traditions. Mr. Paradise might, I believe, have made clearer the connexion between *The Wounds of Civil War* and the Roman Play as a developed *genre*. He does not seem to me to get far with "the type of romantic poem on a classical theme" to which *Glaucus and Scilla* belongs; and, after indicating in a few words why *As You Like It* is to be preferred to *Rosalynde*, he is contented with suggesting that *Rosalynde* was "itself finer than the *Tale of Gamelyn*, in much the same way" (pp. 82, 89). On the other hand, he reopens interesting questions by advancing reasons for dating *The Wounds of Civil War* before 1587 and *Tamburlaine*.

In matters of detail he seems reasonably accurate. He is guilty of making Spenser and Lodge "school mates" (p. 182), and in Appendix C he should have noted that Lodge's *Reply to Gosson* is included in Mr. Saintsbury's *Elizabethan and Jacobean Pamphlets*. There are a number of minor slips in the quotations; and, on page 126, "two" appears for "too," spoiling the sense. The Yale University Press might have made this really valuable study less unattractive as a book.

ARTHUR COLBY SPRAGUE

Harvard University

The New Shakespeare. Edited by Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH and JOHN DOVER WILSON: *The Winter's Tale*. Cambridge University Press; New York, The Macmillan Co., 1931. Pp. xxvii + 206. \$1.75.

The chief interest in the "New Cambridge" edition of *The Winter's Tale* will be found (where those familiar with the series will first look for it) in Professor Dover Wilson's discussion of the 'Copy' for the play on pages 109-127. Other features must be more briefly discussed.

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's Introduction deals very pleasantly with the questions of date and source, and then rather gloomily with the question how far Shakespeare succeeded in the play. Four faults are charged against the dramatist, of which one is the irrelevance of Autolycus and another the failure to present the recognition-scene between Leontes and Perdita on the stage. The conclusion is that "most lovers of Shakespeare will confess to a feeling

of disappointment"—a matter to be decided, I suppose, by the amount of critical fastidiousness that said lovers permit themselves. Sir Arthur's remark (page viii) that the authenticity of Forman's Diary "(so far as we know) is not disputed" should be qualified by reference to the considerable doubt of its authenticity expressed in Dr. J. Q. Adams's recent edition of *Macbeth*. The parenthetical allusion (p. x) to Jonson "belonging to Shakespeare's Company at that date" (i.e., the date of *Bartholomew Fair*) is careless. Jonson never really "belonged" to Shakespeare's company, and at the date of *Bartholomew Fair* was not even writing for it, but for the Lady Elizabeth's Servants at the Hope Theatre. And Greene had been dead not nine years (p. xiv) but nineteen in 1611.

The handling of the text is perhaps the least satisfactory part of the volume, and the part which has been most perfunctorily accomplished. When one has praised the neat and accurate typography of the Cambridge printers, there is not a great deal more to praise except the ingeniousness of some of the added stage directions. The editor's statement that "all significant departures from the Folio text, including emendations in punctuation, are recorded" has not been strictly justified. Some words in the Folio have been silently omitted, legitimate old forms like "murther" and "vildly" silently normalized, and the good work of the Folio in systematically distinguishing between syllabic *-ed* and nonsyllabic *'d* in past verbal forms has been set at naught. The practice of sometimes spelling as "blest" the sound that the Folio regularly prints "bless'd" and sometimes spelling it "blessed" becomes a real obstacle to the easy reading of the lines. Most jarring of all, to me, is the punctuation. The prefatory instructions to the reader inform him that "four dots represent a full-stop in the original, except when it occurs at the end of a speech"; but this law, like the more laxly stated one for three dots, is more honored in the breach than the observance. In a single scene that I have collated with the Folio (V. i) the four-dot symbol is eight times inserted; but the scene contains eleven other full-stops within speeches that have not been disturbed. I doubt whether the novelties of punctuation in this edition have yet amounted to much more than an advertising device. Is it unreasonable to ask that in future volumes Professor Dover Wilson should either ruthlessly carry out his rules,—which, to be sure, would fly-speck his text pretty badly,—or else abandon them?

There are as usual some very clever notes. Perhaps the two best are the conjecture about the stage action accompanying I. ii. 83-6 and the emendation of "I haue lou'd thee" in I. ii. 324 to "T' have loved the —," which greatly helps the sense of a difficult passage.

The section on 'The Copy for *The Winter's Tale*', which I have mentioned above, utilizes effectively the recent bibliographical

studies of E. E. Willoughby, F. P. Wilson, and R. C. Bald. Following Mr. Willoughby, Professor Dover Wilson assumes that the play was set up a year or more after the other comedies in the Folio, probably about May, 1623, and at the period when the printers were also at work on *Richard II.* Following F. P. Wilson and Bald, he argues that the manuscript text used by the printers was one prepared by Ralph Crane, scrivener for the King's Men, to replace the "allowed book" which we know from Herbert's office-book to have been missing in August, 1623, and which Mr. Dover Wilson thinks was already lost when the Folio printing was begun in 1621—hence the narrow escape *The Winter's Tale* had from being omitted altogether.

To explain the nature of the manuscript imputed to Crane and employed as copy for the Folio version of the play, Mr. Dover Wilson again advances his theory of the "assembled" text, which he has used to explain the bibliographical peculiarities of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. The Folio texts of these two plays share with each other, and in part with the *Winter's Tale*, the phenomenon known as "massed entrances." That is, all the characters who participate in a scene are listed in the opening stage direction as "entering," even though the actual entrance of some of them may not occur till several pages later. In the *Two Gentlemen* and the *Merry Wives* this is the uniform practice and there is an almost complete lack of the necessary notes of entrance and exit and of other stage directions within the scenes. Professor Dover Wilson and Mr. Crompton Rhodes argue that such texts were "assembled" by copying out in proper sequence the separate actors' parts with the aid of the prompter's "plot" or tabular list of scenes. Mr. Wilson illustrated this theory in 1923 by a very apt metaphor:

In the players' parts you had, so to speak, the flesh and blood of the play, and in the "plot" the skeleton. So, by combining the two elements, you got something which, but for one omission, came remarkably close to the original prompt-book. That omission, however, was a serious one; it was the nervous system of the play, the coming and going of the characters, the business and movement on the stage, in a word the stage directions.

Many very sound bibliographers—Dr. Greg, Sir Edmund Chambers, and Mr. Bald, for example—decline to accept the assembled text theory even for the two Shakespeare plays that it best fits. Be that as it may, the theory does not seem to me to fit *The Winter's Tale* without unwarranted stretching of the textual facts. One reason is that, as Mr. Wilson admits, the "nervous system" is not really absent in the Folio version of this play. Though the entrances are commonly massed and the descriptive stage directions are less frequent than usual, the necessary entrances and exits within the scenes are generally marked. The other reason, which Mr. Wilson does not appear to have noted, is that in two scenes of

The Winter's Tale (IV. iii and V. ii) there is no trace of "massing" whatever: the procedure here is entirely that of the normal prompt copy. All in all, the idea that this text was produced by a scribe who could supply an accurate sequence of speeches and a list of the characters taking part in each scene, but by hypothesis had no information about stage business, seems to me illusory.

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

Translation, An Elizabethan Art. By F. O. MATTHIESSEN. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931. Pp. x + 232. \$2.50.

Books and articles innumerable have discussed the four Elizabethan translators, Hoby, North, Florio, and Holland; none have brought to the consideration of these four collectively the penetration of analysis and distinction of style which Matthiessen brings to them. He establishes beyond controversy that these translations are a part of the great creative literature of the Elizabethan age. No better example of a translation having its origin in the feeling that "new books would . . . bring new blood and vigor to the stock" of England could have been selected than Hoby's *Courtier* containing as it does the important cultural ideas of the Renaissance. Matthiessen admits that Hoby's "knowledge of the language was far from perfect," listing amusing errors, but succeeds in convincing the reader nevertheless of the singular greatness of the translation. Hoby's use of "doublets," "robustness of style," "striking images," "native turns of speech," inserted "verbs of action," "colloquial tone" convert an Italian courtier into an English gentleman. Because Hoby wrote with an "immediacy to his subject," "if the reader of English wants to feel Castiglione's . . . power and charm, he must seek it in Hoby's pages."

Matthiessen makes no excessive claims for the translator's linguistic accomplishments in North's *Plutarch*. North's Greek and Latin did not enable him to correct Amyot's translation which he in turn was translating. North moreover "made mistakes of his own." But even in these cases it is sometimes "extraordinary how North's inaccuracies improve the context." He converts "the abstract to the concrete, the vague to the pictorial." "There is dignity and restraint in Amyot, picturesque vigor in North." Particularly important is the suggestion that Elizabethan life and customs may be reconstructed from the points of departure of North from Amyot.

The infinite variety of shades of Montaigne's thought, its sudden twists and turns, make the *Essays* a difficult problem for the translator, as two important translations appearing during the last seven years and another in process of completion attest. Matthies-

sen quotes Florio as to all translations: "dimished as much as artes nature is short of natures art." Florio's "punctuation is dark, any number of single words are left out, negatives appear for positives and singulars for plurals on almost every page." But Florio's departures are almost as interesting as the niceties of the French itself. Florio brings words for example into the English language which many people would object to, and instructs his readers by weaving into the body of the text what modern editors would relegate to glossary and footnotes. Montaigne's simple "l'endroit du Diaphragme" becomes in Florio "Diaghragme, which is a membrane lying athwart the lower part of the breast, separating the heart and lights from the stomach." Portions of studies therefore concerning influences of Montaigne through Florio should be revised.

Philemon Holland is saved for the last because in an age of great translations he "stood preëminent." Matthiessen's analysis of Holland's art is even more thoroughgoing than of the others. The results are rich in variety. "The steady desire for clarity" results in "in contionem escendit" becoming "went up into the pulpit to deliver an Oration unto them." "His love of . . . elaboration" accounts for contrasts of his own. How his style was relatively free from the fads of Lyly and DuBartas is contrasted with Florio's inclination in these directions. An immense number of other details illustrate the singular combination in Holland of accuracy and art, to be found in no other Elizabethan translator in such just proportions.

Faults may be found in Matthiessen's book. There are repetitions of phrase in the treatment of similar details. The vogue of Plutarch is touched upon without mention of the valuable monograph of Miss Shackford (*Plutarch in Renaissance England*, 1929). It is possibly inadvisable to introduce a two-page treatment of so immensely important a translation as Sylvester's DuBartas, even for the excellent purpose for which it is introduced, after excluding verse translations from treatment. But it must be admitted that Matthiessen writes better about this very translation than does any one in recent years. And this suggests the finest phase of Matthiessen's book, its living quality. What is said of Holland applies to Matthiessen: "It was natural of Holland to speak of these books as though they were flesh and blood." Scholars will welcome in his book an unconscious but most effective answer to the strictures of the new school of humanists against scholarly productions, as Matthiessen writes with every whit as much literary skill, philosophical penetration, and artistic warmth and color about word and phrase as humanists do about the most alluring aspects of the aesthetic provinces of literature.

GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR

University of North Carolina

The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri. Translated by JEFFERSON BUTLER FLETCHER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931. Pp. xxii + 471. \$5.00.

Mr. Fletcher offers not only a new translation of Dante's masterpiece but a new medium for it. In his succinct Introduction he argues convincingly that blank verse is unsatisfactory, and that the preservation of the tercet is essential, in rendering this poem. He believes, however, that a terza rima version has two grave drawbacks: the difficulty of that metre in our rhyme-poor language, and the actual unpleasantness, in English verse, of so many rhymes. He proposes to obviate both of these drawbacks by the simple but hitherto untried expedient of leaving the middle line of each tercet unrhymed.

This modified tercet form is an interesting experiment. It undoubtedly does lighten the task of the translator in many instances. It sacrifices, on the other hand, that effect of linked progression which is so characteristic of Dante's verse. It also sacrifices much of the equally characteristic effect of lyricism. And I am not sure whether it is any less stubborn a medium than the form which I have elsewhere proposed for rendering the *Commedia*: terza rima with a very liberal use of imperfect rhymes. This form has three rhymes where Mr. Fletcher's has only two; but any two of its three rhymes or, indeed, no two of them may be perfect rhymes,—whereas in Mr. Fletcher's tercets all the rhymes must, because of their fewness, be exact, or else the passage seems blank verse (as occasionally happens in the present translation), and it is invariably the first and last lines of each tercet that must be fashioned to rhyme exactly. As for Mr. Fletcher's other objection to terza rima, the over-prominence of its rhymes, this too is obviated where imperfect rhymes are freely employed.

Whatever the merits or demerits of his formula, Mr. Fletcher's actual performance unquestionably ranks high among the many translations of Dante. He has not always, I think, fully exploited the possibilities afforded by the unrhymed mid-tercet lines; there are many places where small changes, even of word-order, would improve the verse; sometimes the meaning is not clear at first sight, especially in the doctrinal parts of the *Paradiso* (which perhaps would benefit by bolder departures from literal rendering); but on the whole this translation is comparable, among those of the entire *Commedia*, only with that of Melville Best Anderson. My impression is that Mr. Fletcher's *Inferno* is a little the better of the two, though less well done than the subsequent sections of either; in the *Purgatorio* the honors are doubtful; Mr. Anderson's *Paradiso* is distinctly the better. An appraisal of the two versions tercet by tercet might very possibly discover superiority in more of Mr. Fletcher's tercets than of Mr. Anderson's. But Mr.

Anderson's terza rima, read in larger units, reveals a lyric quality, and his finest passages attain a poetic height, which Mr. Fletcher never quite achieves. When Mr. Fletcher is at his best, his excellence lies in a precision of simple and euphonious diction moulded into effective phrases—an excellence which frequently characterizes good prose as well as good verse. His translation offers in some sense a compromise between the ideals of those people who want their *Divine Comedy* in English blank verse, or even prose, and of those who want theirs in terza rima; and both of these hitherto irreconcilable factions will find in its pages much that should please them. Mr. Fletcher's rendering of the *Commedia* is especially notable for the frequency with which he has departed from the phraseology employed by previous translators with little individual variation, and has expressed the meaning of the original in an entirely new way.

LACY LOCKERT

Nashville, Tennessee

Tolstoy, Literary Fragments, Letters and Reminiscences not previously published. Edited by RENÉ FÜLÖP-MILLER, translated by PAUL ENGLAND. New York: The Dial Press, 1931. Pp. xvi + 330. \$5.00.

Tolstoy's literary remains, first bequeathed to mankind in general, then to his daughter, Alexandra, and finally appropriated by the Soviet government, are in process of publication. Certain selections from them, translated into very satisfactory English, are for the first time presented to the public in this volume. It includes *The Dekabrists*, which was the point of departure for *War and Peace*, fragments of novels and stories, two plays, a number of letters, and extracts from friends' recollections of the master. The collection is essential to a complete understanding of Tolstoy, makes good reading, and brings out both his admirable qualities and his limitations, as the following quotations will show:

(Lucerne, July 9, 1857) Apple-trees, masses of leaves, crowd round the windows. The waving grass, the lake, the mountains—all is peace, silence, solitude. The old woman who waits on me has faded yellow hair, a baggy throat, and a little, wrinkled, good-humoured face. She is deaf as a post, and speaks some impossible sort of *patois*, not a word of which can I understand. She is old and ugly, and busied all the time with washing and cleaning. She fetches water, too, and does all sorts of hard work. But she is always laughing; her laugh is that of a child, so musical, so jolly, that even the two yellow teeth which it reveals have a charm of their own.

(Paris, April 6, 1857) I could tell you a lot more about things here that have come under my notice—for instance, a club of "folk-poets," which meets in one of the suburbs, and to which I go on Sundays. But Turgenev was right when he said that these people have no real poetry. They know

only one kind, the political, for which I have always felt a loathing, and never more than now.

(Yasnaya Polyana, March 15, 1907) Of one thing, however, I am absolutely certain: not only the majority, but all the plays ascribed to Shakespeare (*Hamlet*, etc., not excepted) are quite undeserving of the extravagant praise which is generally bestowed upon them. From an artistic point of view, indeed, I should rather describe them as beneath criticism.

(From his physician's diary, Nov. 21, 1905) At lunch-time he quoted some funny passages from Dickens, and laughed till the tears ran down his cheeks. He then read us that passage from *Little Dorrit* where money is shown to prove disastrous not only to the receiver, but to every one else. "What a splendid fellow this Dickens is!" he said. "I should like to write something about him."

(Beginning of 1881) I only wish I could say all that I feel about Dostoevsky. . . . I never saw him, nor had any direct communication with him, but now that he is dead I realize that he was dearer, nearer, and more necessary to me than any other person. I never dreamed of trying to rival him—never! Everything he did was so good, so genuine, that it rejoiced my heart.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Codex A M 619 quarto. Old Norwegian Book of Homilies containing *The Miracles of Saint Olaf* and Alcuin's *De Virtutibus et Vitiis*. By GEORGE T. FLOM. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XIV, No. 4, November 1929. (Issued April, 1931.)

The manuscript of homilies here presented in diplomatic reprint by Professor Flom is linguistically one of the most important Norwegian documents extant. As the only complete edition earlier published (by Unger, Christiania, 1862-4) was not prepared with the meticulous attention to detail required by modern linguists and is, furthermore, out of print, the new edition is very welcome.

In the volume just issued, Professor Flom presents not only an accurately transcribed text but also ten excellent facsimiles—adequate for the reader to familiarize himself with the peculiarities of the paleography. As far as modern printing can reproduce them, these peculiarities are also maintained in the printed page. Thus, the tall *a*, the various forms of *r* and *s*, the Anglo-Saxon *w* for *v*, all are retained; and all editorial expansions are set out by means of italics.

The Introduction, devoted almost wholly to a paleographic analysis, is less satisfactory than the text itself. The arrangement is confusing and the style often crabbed. Thus, a reference to the text does not make the discussion of *Lacunae*, p. 15, clear; here Unger's edition and Wadstein's monograph¹ supply the necessary information. Even more true is this of the discussion of the

¹ *Fornnorska Homiliebokens Ljudlära*, Upsala, 1890.

various hands of the manuscript (pp. 15 ff.). Not once, as far as I can see, does the editor clearly state what parts are assigned to each of the main scribes. Again one must turn to Wadstein. At times, too, the discussion is out of proportion. Thus, over a page is devoted to the *Position of the Accent*, not an important point, while no space is given to the significant problem of symbols of abbreviation. Again, under the heading *Scribal Errors*, we find lumped numerous spellings clearly not "errors" but dialectal peculiarities, and recognized as such by the editor.

Some unfortunate errors have crept in. In the section entitled *The Technique of the Letter ø* (p. 47 ff.), appears an elaborate criticism of Unger's reading *eyrum*, fol. 72a, 14, instead of *øyrum*; when we turn to the text, we find to our surprise the reading *eyrum* adopted. Similarly, on p. 49, Flom argues for *dømom*, fol. 3b, 12, instead of *demom*. In the text *demom* is adopted.

The most significant contribution of the Introduction is the section on *Function of the Accent Mark*, in which it is suggested that the accent is used not only to mark vowel length, but also to show sentence stress (p. 19). If this claim can be fully substantiated and worked out in detail, the results will be of far-reaching significance.

It is, however, rather in the text and excellent facsimiles that the chief value of the volume will be found.

HENNING LARSEN

University of Iowa

Sir William Temple a Seventeenth Century "Libertin." By CLARA MARBURG. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford, 1932. Pp. xviii + 128. \$2.00.

The title is a little startling, and Miss Marburg does not explicitly explain it. She uses "libertin" however in its intellectual sense of a "free thinker," and is no doubt right in considering Temple as in general sympathy with Montaigne. She shows that he was neither hopeful of any great results from the new Baconian science, nor at all affected, though Cudworth had been his teacher in his youth, by the intuitionism of the Cambridge Platonists. He should not be treated as most of his commentators (except Spingarn) have done, and as is suggested by *The Battle of the Books*, as an out and out supporter of the Ancients against the Moderns. He shows an unexpected interest in different types of culture, especially those of the Chinese, the Incas of Peru, the Turks and the Goths—in the last case almost anticipating Gray. He held that as there had been no progressive advance or decline in man's powers, outbursts of literary brilliance might occur and probably had oc-

curred in all sort of places where the climate and the circumstances of the moment were favorable. In the regulation of his life Temple was a discreet Epicurean, and, looking to literature to provide rather a high type of pleasure than instruction, the pleasure afforded by Rabelais and Don Quixote, he was against subjecting it to strict rules. The English drama had an advantage over the French in its humorous characters, the result of the English climate and the liberty enjoyed by its people to live as they liked.

Miss Marburg has worked out the dates of Temple's several essays and has traced the sources of much of his knowledge. She does not however tell us where he got his notion of "the great Almanzor." Her thesis contains much illustrative matter which is evidence of wide reading. Her aim is however a somewhat limited one. Though her chapters are headed "The moral philosopher", "The historian", "The critic", she practically confines her examination to two or three of Temple's later essays. She pays no attention to what we know of him and his opinions as a young man. He learnt Spanish for example not at the Hague (p. 61), but at Brussels in 1652.

Miss Marburg's book shows traces of the influence of the modern school of cynical biography. She refuses to be righteously indignant over the treatment Temple received for his brilliant and patriotic services, or to sigh over what might have been, had William III been his master from the beginning. To her Temple is "one who had tried to get on with the world and failed" (p. xiii), "who had overreached himself politically and who spent the rest of his life building up his shattered ego" (p. xiv). Lady Giffard's affectionate devotion to her brother is seen as "solicitous flattery" (p. xiii). This attitude strikes the old-fashioned as not quite generous.

The book has rather too many misprints; e. g. libre penseura (= libres penseurs) p. 20, que (= qui), suite (= fuite) p. 21, occurs p. 22, omniscient p. 23, viellards p. 48, qu'est (= qui est), men (= man) p. 49, une (= uns) p. 53, le louange p. 81, plusiers p. 87, Nicklih (= Nicklin—he was a poet of distinction) p. 100, Steward (= Stewart) p. 123.

G. C. MOORE SMITH

Sheffield, England

BRIEF MENTION

The Devil in Legend and Literature. By MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN. Chicago and London: The Open Court, 1931. Pp. xvi + 354. \$3.00. Dr. Rudwin, known for numerous studies of the Devil in various literatures, has published in this volume a series

of essays devoted to his hero, whose origins, tastes, behavior, and reputation he amply describes. While the book is addressed primarily to a popular audience and consequently contains much material that is well known to scholars, it also shows wide reading and much genuine knowledge, so that it should be of interest to students of religion, of folk-lore, and of literature. Dr. R. refers to a host of men of letters who, like their chief representatives, Milton, Dante, and Goethe, have brought the Devil into their works, and makes his remarks about them easily accessible by the addition of an excellent index. One can only believe with M. Piquet, cited by Dr. R., that, "si l'âme de M. Rudwin est un jour menacé de choir dans l'abîme infernal, nul doute que le maître du logis ne lui tienne compte de l'avoir ainsi réhabilité."

H. C. L.

A Shakespeare Bibliography. By WALTER EBISCH and LEVIN L. SCHUCKING. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1931. Pp. xviii + 294. \$7.50. Practising scholars will find this work very useful. For beginners and amateurs its inconsistencies and mistakes, fewer it is true of commission than of omission, will make it less valuable. Yet the compilers are to be congratulated on the conception and prosecution of their difficult task. Their method is to draw up an elaborate system of categories covering every aspect of the study of Shakespeare and his age—it occupies nine and a half pages in the table of contents. The subheading for works about the ghosts, for example, is numbered VIII, 2, (b), (v), (dd), (γγ). The multiplication of subheadings complicates the classification of many items. Thus one is surprised not to find Miss Bartlett's *Mr. William Shakespeare* beside her *Catalogue of the Exhibition* under "I. Shakespeare Bibliography," though it later appears under "V, (2), (a), Bibliography of Oldest Texts" and, less logically, under "VI, (1), (b), General Studies of Shakespeare's Sources, Literary Influences, and Cultural relations." It would not be difficult to compile a list of serious omissions, for the aim, while selective, was to include every indispensable work. Perhaps the most serious weakness is the relative neglect of Elizabethan source materials; perhaps the greatest strength is the large number of German titles. The lack of adequate reference to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century documents is illustrated by "III, 4, The Most Important Biographies." The list begins with Drake and Halliwell. Even if the notes of the seventeenth-century antiquarians were to be ignored, one would expect Rowe to lead the modern list. But the references to works of recent scholarship, both books and articles, are very helpful; and the multiplicity of the categories undoubtedly facilitates rapid reference.

H. S.